DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 525 VT 010 753

AUTHOR	Hamburger, Martin; LoCascio, Ralph
TITLE	A Study of Manpower Development and Training Act Programs in New York State.
INSTITUTION	New York Univ., N.Y. Center for Field Research and School Services.
SPONS AGENCY	New York State Education Dept., Albany.
PUB DATE	Nov 69
NOTE	195p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$9.85
DESCRIPTORS	*Adult Vocational Education, Employment Programs, Employment Services, *Federal Programs, Individual Characteristics, *Manpower Development, Program Development, *Program Evaluation, *State Surveys, Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS	*Manpower Development and Training Act Programs, MDTA Programs, Multi Center Training Programs, New York

ABSTRACT

A study of the process and product of Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) programs was conducted from May 1968 to June 1969. Data were collected by surveying the multi-centers, extensive staff reviews, mail followup, a review of related literature, and consultations. Results of the study include: (1) a survey of the feasibility and problems of evaluating a state-wide MDTA program, (2) a field study of the multi-centers, their operations, programs, staff and trainees, (3) an analysis of the sources of data, their accessibility and their usefulness, and (4) recommendations concerning needs and priorities for MDTA research and evaluation. A mail followup story of former trainees will be included in a separate report. While this study is limited to one program in one state, it contains implications for MDTA research methodology and programs in general. (CH)

ED038525

A STUDY OF MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT PROGRAMS IN NEW YORK STATE

DO NOT FILM THIS PAGE

by

MARTIN HAMBURGER

and

RALPH LO CASCIO

The Center for Field Research and School Services
School of Education
New York University
November 1969

VT010753

ED038525

A STUDY OF MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT PROGRAMS IN NEW YORK STATE

by

Martin Hamburger
Professor of Education, New York University
Head, Division of Vocational Education and Applied Arts and Science

and

Ralph LoCascio
Professor of Education, New York University

With the Collaboration of

Miriam H. Krohn and Susan P. Schrenzel
Research Associates

The Center for Field Research and School Services
School of Education
New York University
November 1969

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

VT010753

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
School of Education
Center for Field Research and School Services
Office of Off-Campus Courses
51 PRESS BUILDING
WASHINGTON SQUARE, NEW YORK, N.Y. 10003
AREA 212 598-2898

November 25, 1969

Dr. Louis A. Cohen, Chief
Bureau of Occupational Education Research
The University of the State of New York
The State Education Department
Albany, New York 12224

Dear Dr. Cohen:

In fulfillment of an agreement dated May 1, 1968 between the New York State Education Department and the Center for Field Research and School Services, I am pleased to submit twenty-five copies of a report entitled, A Study of Manpower Development and Training Act Programs in New York State.

The New York State Education Department deserves commendation for establishing a cooperative relationship which made it possible to complete this significant study. Undoubtedly, the study findings will prove useful to many educational agencies and communities throughout the United States. The professional staffs involved were most cooperative in providing data, offering counsel, and facilitating the study in general. The spirit of good will which prevailed during the study augurs well for an effective follow through on its implications.

Obviously, all recommendations in this report are not equally viable. Final decisions, moreover, are always the prerogative of constituted authority rather than of a consulting team, regardless of the latter's expertise. This report will serve its purpose best if it is studied and discussed by all who are concerned with the Manpower Development Act Programs in New York and elsewhere. To this end, the authors are prepared to assist with the presentation and interpretation of the report.

New York University and its Center for Field Research and School Services look forward to a continued association with the State of New York in this important research endeavor.

Respectfully submitted,

ARNOLD SPINNER
Director

AS:n

A STUDY OF MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT PROGRAMS IN NEW YORK STATE

ERRATA

Page 16, line one - insert "revised" before "Form 103."

Page 45, introductory paragraph, last sentence - insert "Buffalo" after "Binghamton."

Page 135, line three - change "supplement" to "support."

Page 141, line one, in Heading, insert "During" after "Status."

Page 185, last bibliographic item - change "1968-1969" to "1966-1969."

PREFACE

This is a study of the Manpower Development and Training Act program of New York State. While the scope of the Study is limited to one state, to one program (MDTA), and further, to selected aspects of that program, nevertheless it may have implications for MDTA research methodology and programs in general. The reader may gain further perspective on our study if he knows that a body of data dealing with the follow-up study of former trainees is currently being analyzed and prepared as a companion report to be issued as soon as possible.

Although it is a rather full report, many details such as the array of instruments, the several progress reports, and other documents have not been included simply because of the sheer bulk. However, these materials are available at New York University and at the New York State Education Department.

A word is in order about the influence on our study of such practical considerations as limited funding and resources, inaccessibility of data, and a low point in program operations. The exigencies of programmatic research make great demands on the establishment of priorities, and over these there may be genuine differences. However, each researcher must make ongoing decisions in this regard, within the framework of a basic design. We hope that others may be helped in their programmatic or research responsibilities through a critical analysis of our priorities and emphases.

Suggestions and recommendations for further study permeate the report. We feel a sense of urgency in pressing for continued research else some of the more valuable understandings that should guide public policy during these critical years may be lost. However, while continuing research and study are of great importance, the far-reaching, and yet immediate implications of MDTA programs for the lives of so many people point to the equally great need for early utilization and application of such research findings.

From the time that the contract was arranged, the climate in which we conducted this study was characterized by complete independence. This was possible only because the sponsoring agency, the New York State Department of Education, and in particular, Dr. John Leslie, Director of the Division of Special Occupational Services, desired, encouraged and then cultivated such independence. This in no way diminished helpfulness and cooperativeness, as the open doors and the open files of the Department clearly testified. We are extremely grateful to many staff members of the State Education Department for this combination of judicious separateness and close helpfulness.

A special debt of acknowledgement is due to Dr. Louis Cohen, Chief of the Bureau of Occupational Education Research, for his keen interest and understanding of this study and his mustering of all possible resources to support it. The unique service of Mrs. Dorothy King, the State Education Department Liaison Officer for our project, merits singular attention because of her broad perspective and her efforts concerning the smallest details, as well as her personal warmth and professional knowledge. The experience and expertise that Carl Benenati and Louis Siy provided, especially during the early stages, are also gratefully acknowledged.

In the New York State Department of Labor, there were many people who helped us with advice and information; in particular, Karel F. Ficek, Miss Estelle Schrifte and Emile Skraly of the Research and Statistics Office, Division of Employment.

In our efforts to get both perspective and relevant data, we found that in the U.S. Office of Education, Dr. Howard A. Matthews, Director of the

Division of Manpower Development and Training, and his staff, especially Mrs. Jean Williams, were gracious, knowledgeable and helpful. In the Planning and Evaluation Branch of the Division of Vocational and Technical Education, Dr. Bernard Michael and Mrs. Jane Perry gave invaluable time, very helpful materials and careful thought to our study.

As the list of those whose aid we sought grows, it should also serve to convey the complexity and ramifications of the Study. Thus, to get a clear picture of the realities of data access considerable discussions were necessary with a number of people at the U.S. Department of Labor, especially Sigmund Berkman, Chief, Division of Program Reports, Office of Manpower Data Systems.

The Study would have been impossible without the willing cooperation of the directors and staffs of the MDT Multi-Centers of New York State. Although study outcomes could not be expected for some time they gave of themselves generously in the interviews and data collection. Our gratitude for this major cooperation is beyond words. In naming the directors we acknowledge their entire staffs collectively: Henry Duwe (Buffalo); Joseph Fanella (Syracuse); Sterling C. Goplerud (White Plains); Santo Marzullo (Rochester); Sherman R. Mears (Utica); Garrett Nyweide (Binghamton); Miss Helen Warren (Albany); Leverett P. Wenk (New Hyde Park). In New York City, where the multi-centers operate through the central Board of Education, we acknowledge first Herman Kressel, Director, and Dr. Herman Slotkin, Associate Director for invaluable cooperation, materials and information. Again, we thank the New York City staffs through their center directors: Mrs. Drewlyn Chessa, Lionel Forstall, Homer Gillis, Algernon Henry, and Sidney Huchital.

A good deal of what may be valuable in this study is due to the unusual range and breadth of consultants on whom we were able to call. We were honored greatly and learned much from the visit and consultation of Mrs. Anna Wiman, Director of Manpower Training Education Programs for Sweden, who was with us in the fall of 1968. Her long experience and deep insights provided us with many opportunities for comparison and for the re-examination of assumptions. Dr. Jerome Harkins not only surveyed the problems of data access but, with his broad research background, was helpful in a variety of ways. In the report itself his contribution is notable in Chapters II and III for which he prepared the initial drafts.

In the development and testing of our instruments we were especially fortunate in being able to call on Dr. Herbert Righthand, Chief of the Bureau of Vocational Services, Connecticut State Department of Education; Dr. Raymond Van Tassel, Professor of Vocational Education, New York University; and Gerald Sircus, formerly with the Xerox Corporation, Education Division. Dr. Morton Margules, Associate State Director of Vocational Education, New Jersey State Department of Education and Dr. Eberhard Thieme, Director of Vocational Education. Rochester Board of Education, were uniquely valuable team members responsible for facilities evaluation on site visitations.

We conclude with acknowledgements to our immediate staff, starting first with the major contributions of Mrs. Miriam Krohn and Miss Susan Schrenzel. Mrs. Krohn was a dedicated and involved staff member from the inception to the completion of the project; her versatility and enthusiasm were great assets. Miss Schrenzel, who joined us later, assumed a major role in data collection and data analysis; she handled her responsibilities with vigor and competence. We are indeed pleased to list them as collaborators.

Mrs. Miriam Grinker and Harold Kaufman helped at important points in the review of literature, in the selection of samples and in the preparation of instruments. Mrs. Grinker also ably participated in several site visitations.

Our Project Secretary, Mrs. Elizabeth McCutcheon, was truly omnipresent and was one of the most hardworking and devoted staff members, providing help beyond the call of duty. Secretarial help was also provided by Miss Julie Eis in the early phase of the Study. Mrs. Jeanne Gormley helped thereafter in many invaluable ways particularly in the preparation of the final report. Additional clerical and research assistance came from Linda Feldmeier, John Gormley and Kay McCutcheon.

Finally, we note with great appreciation both the manner and the substance of Dr. Arnold Spinner's contribution as Director of the Center for Field Research and School Services.

Martin Hamburger
Ralph LoCascio

November 1969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Preface iii

PART ONE – BACKGROUND: THE DESIGN, THE LITERATURE AND EXISTING DATA

Chapter I – BACKGROUND AND DESIGN OF THE STUDY 3

- Plan of the Report 3
- The Inception of the Project 4
- Design of the Study 6
- A Summary of Methods and Procedures 9
- The New York University Study in the Context of Other Studies 11
- The Study in Prospect and Retrospect 12

Chapter II – AN OVERVIEW OF MDTA IN NEW YORK STATE 13

- Description of the Literature 13
- MDTA and the Economy of New York State 17

Chapter III – ANALYSIS OF EXISTING DATA 25

- Towards the Development of Evaluative Criteria 25
- Description of the Population 26
- Analysis of Programs 32
  - The Course Offerings 34
  - Costs 35
- Outcomes 38
  - The State Follow Up Study 38
  - The Cost-Benefit Study 40

PART TWO – A STUDY OF THE MULTI-CENTER TRAINING PROGRAMS IN NEW YORK STATE

Chapter IV – DESIGN FOR STUDY OF THE MULTI-CENTERS 45

- The Data Collection Framework 45
- The Instruments 46
- Pre-Testing 47
- The Data Collection Schedule 47
- The Study Sample 49

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont)

Page

Chapter V – THE SETTING AND RESOURCES: ADMINISTRATION, STAFF, AND FACILITIES 51

Administration, Supervision and Planning 51
  Administration 51
  Supervision 52
  Planning 53
Personal Characteristics of Center Staff 54
  Age 54
  Sex 56
  Marital Status 57
  Ethnic Background 57
  Educational Level 59
Job Characteristics 61
  Staff Recruitment 61
  Staff Aides 63
  Position Stability 63
  Remuneration 65
  Staff Benefits 68
  Job Satisfaction 69
Staff Training 71
  Preservice Training 71
  Inservice Training 73
  MDT Staff Recommendations 74
  Summary and Recommendations 75
Facilities and Equipment 77
  General 77
  Classrooms 80
MDT Staff General Recommendations 81

Chapter VI – THE SERVICE COMPONENTS: OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING, BASIC EDUCATION, AND COUNSELING 85

Occupational Training 85
  Selection and Assignment of Trainees 85
  Curriculum and Related Matters 87
  Enrollment 88
  Teaching Load 91
  Teaching Methods 95
  Absentee and Dropout Information 99
  Assessment of Trainee Learning 101
  Training Success and Motivation 105
  MDT Staff Recommendations: Skill Training 106
  MDT Staff Recommendations: Prevocational Training 107

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont)

Page

Basic Education 109
    Assignment of Trainees 109
    Curriculum Decisions 110
    Relationship of Basic Education to Skills Training 110
    Enrollment 111
    Teaching Load 111
    Teaching Methods 114
    Assessment of Trainee Learning 116
    Teaching Difficulty 117
    MDT Staff Recommendations 118
Counseling 120
    Counselor Autonomy 120
    Enrollment 121
    Counselor Functions 121
    Group Counseling 124
    Individual Counseling 126
    Assessment of Counseling Effectiveness 128
    Counselor Supervisor Load 128
    Counseling Difficulty 129
    Other Supporting Services 130
    MDT Staff Recommendations 131

Chapter VII – THE PROGRAM AS VIEWED BY CURRENT TRAINEES 133

The Sample 133
Procedures 135
The Findings 136
    Trainee Characteristics 136
        Sex 136
        Age 138
        Ethnic Background 138
        Marital Status 138
        Educational Level 139
        Months in Training Program 140
        Status Three Months Prior to Training 141
    Trainee Attitudes 142
        Reasons for Wanting Training 142
        The Training Program and Services 143
        Outlook for Future Jobs 149
Summary of Qualitative Comments by Trainees 152
Discussion of Current Trainee Data 153

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont)

Page

PART THREE – TOWARDS THE IMPROVEMENT OF MDTA PROGRAMS

Chapter VIII – IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT 159

- Evaluation: Issues and Implications 159
  - The Problems of Evaluation 159
  - Priorities for the Data System 162
  - Conclusions and Recommendations for Evaluation 164
- The Program Components 167
  - Review of Administration, Staff and Facilities 167
  - Recommendations Concerning Administration, Staff and Facilities 169
  - Review of Occupational Training, Basic Education and Counseling 170
  - Recommendations Concerning Occupational Training, Basic Education and Counseling 173
- Implications and Recommendations for Program Policy and Planning 176
  - The Target Population Reconsidered 176
  - The Occupational Course Offerings: Safe and Cyclical 177
  - MDTA: Cornerstone of Manpower Policy or Shifting Sands of Expediency? 179

Selected Bibliography 183

Appendix A - PLAN FOR EVALUATION OF THE MDTA PROGRAMS IN NEW YORK STATE 187

Appendix B - PROPOSED SITE VISIT SCHEDULE 191

PART 1

BACKGROUND: THE DESIGN, THE LITERATURE AND EXISTING DATA

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND AND DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This is the report of the New York University Study of the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) programs of New York State which was conducted from May 1968 to June 1969 at the request of the New York State Education Department. The important outcomes of the study were: (1) a survey of the feasibility and problems of evaluating a statewide MDTA program; (2) a field study of the multi-centers, their operations, programs, staff and trainees; (3) an analysis of the sources of data, their accessibility and their usefulness and (4) recommendations which emerged from these and other aspects of the study. Although a mail follow-up study of former trainees was conducted, the returns were late and details so massive as to entail a separate report; it is accordingly not submitted herewith. Several other aspects of the original plan of the study were not dealt with for reasons detailed elsewhere: primarily lack of availability of data and already strained resources of the project. Thus there are limitations in this report which should be duly noted. However, through a critical analysis of the data resources, surveying the multi-centers, extensive staff interviews, a mail follow-up, a review of related literature and expert consultation, it is possible to present a rather comprehensive report. Thus, recommendations as to needs and priorities for MDTA research and evaluation, the feasibility of conducting such research and evaluation and finally, selected recommendations for MDTA program and administration are presented.

Plan of the Report

With this brief background in mind it may be helpful to provide a guide to the report which follows. The remainder of this chapter presents more about the background of the project, its planning and design, and its execution. Delimitations of the study, a summary of the methods and procedures used, and certain problems encountered in carrying out the study are presented in this opening chapter.

Chapters II and III review and analyze existing literature and data on MDTA programs in New York State, including the basic sources, their accessibility and their utilization. The problems of access are presented in considerable detail due to our dependence on basic data for sample selection to fulfill the original design.

Chapters IV through VII are based on the site visits to the multi-centers and survey the training resources and process in terms of the staff, the program, and the trainees.

Finally Chapter VIII presents conclusions and recommendations. Recommendations include those for improving the reporting system, data collection, and systematic evaluation as well as recommendations concerning curriculum, staffing, recruitment, and other aspects of the MDTA programs of New York State.

The Inception of the Project

As has been noted frequently in the literature, the concern of federal and state governments for program evaluation, including MDTA, has rarely been matched by adequate funding and resources. In New York State, for example, the Division of Special Occupational Services, Bureau of Manpower Development and Training of the State Education Department had been contemplating an evaluation for some time. The sum that had been allocated for this purpose was $48,000; and it was well understood that only a limited study could be made with this sum. The paucity of evaluation studies made further waiting for increased resources unwise in view of the increasing need for better understanding of five years of program experience.

It should also be noted that during the discussions which took place between the contracting parties during the spring of 1968 reference was often made to the likelihood that the New York State Department of Labor might well be undertaking a correlated evaluation of its role in MDTA. In fact, despite the independent functioning of each of these departments, there seemed a distinct possibility that there might be a cooperative study. As discussions proceeded, however, and at the time (May 1, 1968) that the contract from the Education Department to New York University was made, the role of the Labor Department had shrunk to "readiness to cooperate with the evaluators." Accordingly, as the plan for the study was developed the first delimitation was the exclusion from study of most Department of Labor roles in the processing, selection, and assignment of trainees. Thus, in the absence of significant data about trainee characteristics, comparisons between those who actually began a training program and all those who had ever been screened and processed in state employment offices was impossible.

During the period of discussion and negotiation between the New York State Education Department and New York University it was agreed that the major thrust of the study would be the multi-occupational programs of New York State. It was also agreed that primary concern would be with the educational programs, the training process, and effective and promising methods and practices. At the same time there were indications of the areas not to be studied. Thus, the many scattered "regular" training programs throughout the state, individual referrals to private schools or other institutions, on-the-job training, etc. were among the programs excluded from study. Although the problems of proper inclusion or exclusion were later complicated by certain practical considerations, the Plan for Evaluation (Appendix A) presents the essential formulation of the project at the time of the award of contract.

While the formal beginning date was May 1, 1968, it was understood that there would be limited activity until September. The intervening time would be used primarily to recruit staff, to initiate contact with program officers and to arrange for project housing and facilities. The termination date for the project was set for June 30, 1969, with the hope that a first draft report might be ready as early as April. In effect, the active phase of the project was to be about nine months.

Design of the Study

In this section, we present the plan of the study and its modifications as certain reality factors emerged. From the time that the early discussions provided a broad framework and global set of questions to the operational design, the intervening events centered largely on the availability and accessibility of data. Basic sources are described in Chapter II but it is important to note that a lack of baseline data, accurate descriptive statistics, and a data bank which was sufficiently complete to permit the drawing of suitable samples not only prevented secondary analyses but delayed the acquisition of new data.

The first statement of a study plan was made in the contract; in the June 15, 1968, Progrees Report a fuller statement of the design was presented. Even then it was indicated that further modification might still be necessary. The concern was with two basic elements: a study of the product and a study of the process of MDTA training. It was hoped that the use of questionnaires, interviews and records would provide data about training characteristics and program characteristics and that considered with labor market factors these would enable product evaluation. Although this was not the final methodology followed, it must be stated that in retrospect this is both a desirable and feasible framework for such a study.

The essential questions raised in the initial plan remained the same but further detail as to sources of necessary data were indicated. These questions are restated along with selected data sources that appeared usable in June of 1968:

1. What is the trainee dropout situation and why? It is planned that the records for all dropouts, terminated either for good cause or not for good cause, will be inspected at each of the multi-occupational programs and in a selected sample of centers which have conducted or are currently conducting regular or other occupational training

programs. Following identifications of these dropouts, inquiries will be undertaken with a selected sample of the members of this group.

2. What is the specific nature of employment outcome for those who complete training; immediately after training? 6 months or longer, after training? Data will be collected through interview and questionnaires responses of former trainees classified according to occupational field and to MDTA center. Interviews will be conducted by project staff members and in certain areas, to improve validity, by interviewers who are peers of trainees and who have been trained by project staff members.

3. How does employment success or failure relate to the training taken? Data collected through interview and questionnaire responses of former trainees classified according to occupational field and to MDTA center, and of program administrators, teachers, employers, and union officials will be scrutinized in consideration of this question.

4. What aspects of training need improvement or change? Evidence will be gathered through field visits to selected training sites; through interviews with program administrators and instructors; through observations of instructional process in selected occupational fields; and through interviews with trainees, former trainees, employers and union officials, personnel managers, and placement personnel.

One important development that affected the study design, particularly in terms of implying data possibilities, was a meeting on August 6, 1968 between representatives of the State Departments of Labor and Education and members of the New York University Study Team. The focus was on availability of, as well as gaps in population and sample data. Although other considerations affected developments during the next few months, the follow-up meetings between State Labor Department representatives and New York University staff on October 9 and 16 were of special significance. The essence of the conferences, especially the October discussions, was that our plan for collecting population data by occupation, program, and geographical location was unfeasible. Although a seeming compromise was proposed at this time in terms of an available 10 percent sample on tape, the pursuit of these tapes in Albany proved fruitless. All possible sources of data were exhausted by the end of December with the possible exception of the State Department of Education which, at the end of October, agreed to transfer information from OE-4021 forms to punch cards. This would provide identification of all training projects and sections for our sample selection and would presumably serve as the new heart for the descriptive statistics of the MDTA population. These were promised for the first week of January, 1969. However, early in January we were informed that there were still large gaps in the 4021 data necessitating further clerical work. Our plan to conduct a mailed questionnaire from the previously promised sample was now deferred to a later date.

Accordingly, the emphasis in the first three months of 1969 was placed entirely on site visits, a necessary expediency in view of the shrunken availability of other data sources as well as the delays that had been incurred along the way. The components of the study that emerged therefore were primarily three-fold: a depth analysis of all available descriptive statistics; site visits to all multi-centers including questionnaires to current trainees; and finally, a limited mail questionnaire to a large sample of former trainees as a final thrust. Much depended on the processing of the 4021 information: unfortunately, when these data arrived, they were found to be unusable as explained in Chapter III.

Demographic characteristics, the dropout differentiation, occupational distribution, the yearly phases of MDTA: these and many other desirable breakdowns for analysis which had been seriously contemplated in the early plan were now dropped or drastically reduced.

A Summary of Methods and Procedures

A full account of what we have done can be found in each chapter. The following summarizes the several areas of activity in the Study as:

1. Reviewing relevant literature and data including reports, forms and previous studies.

While the focus of our review was on evaluation studies, such terms as cost benefits, follow-up, and effectiveness were more common though diffuse. There were a number of either global studies which lacked the specific details required by our present focus, or rather detailed and specialized studies which were difficult to extrapolate. Our review was highly pragmatic, concentrating on the gleaning of variables, instruments, questionnaire items, evaluation criteria, and interview guide-lines. There did not seem to be any other state-wide evaluation and accordingly we drew freely in order to arrive at both design and methodology. Our review increasingly revealed what most officials in the various agencies had indicated: there was a paucity of either published or unpublished material on MDTA evaluations.

2. Sample selection. A detailed discussion of this component is primarily found in Chapters II and III.

Rather than repeating here the details of the search for an adequate data bank, we have presented the essence of what there is and recommendations as to what there should be in Chapters II, III and VIII.

3. Site visitations including the preparation of necessary interview and questionnaire forms, selecting and training visitation teams, arranging visits, pilot try-outs, administering forms and questionnaires, conducting interviews, and obtaining related data.

The site visitations were limited to the multi-centers, eight upstate and five in New York City. Although it had been hoped that these visits would be made during a time when enrollment would permit observation of "normal" operations, the necessity for obtaining descriptive data about the program as a whole, and of each Center in particular, caused some of the delays previously described. During November, 1968 there was an important set of visitations made by an international authority on manpower training, Mrs. Anna Wiman, Director of Manpower Training for Sweden. On several of these visits, the project director accompanied Mrs. Wiman and thus made the initial contacts with the multi-centers. The discussions, the observations, the report of Mrs. Wiman are summarized in Chapters V and VIII, but it is difficult to separate her stimulating ideas and advice from other sources in this study. The details of the actual team visitations are presented in Chapters IV through VII.

4. Preparation of mail questionnaires for former trainees, selecting sample, arranging for mailing lists, and developing control systems.

The details of this sub-study will be presented in the supplementary report of this study if adequate resources to do so can be obtained.

5. Data processing and analysis under two major categories:
    a. Statistical and quantitative including scoring, tabulation, punching, arranging for programming, computerizing and synthesizing data from current trainee questionnaires, and to some extent from past trainees' questionnaires.
    b. Qualitative analysis of the training programs and processes based on direct observations, processing these, and quantifying them.

6. Preparation of the report entailed some considerations which are mentioned here so that the reader may make the best use of our study.

Due to the length of the report it was decided that all highly detailed background or methodological materials would be made available on request only. It was also clear that some repetition of methodology would occur between this basic chapter and the various chapters dealing with specific subproblems of the study.

The New York University Study in the Context of Other Studies

No comprehensive review of other MDTA research is presented here inasmuch as our focus was selective. Mangum and Levitan, notably, have provided us with excellent reviews, which taken together with the President's Manpower Reports and the other federal publications form a growing body of useful literature. As for specific programmatic studies, they are few and have various limitations. One way of classifying studies is in terms of size. Thus, there are several studies with large samples which produce gross data, broad conclusions, and provide little insight or depth into understanding of programs, process or even outcome. On the other hand, studies that did attempt relating complex sets of variables, and considered the interaction of these variables, have usually dealt with small samples, rather exceptional training programs or were otherwise esoteric.

The limitations of both these types of evaluation impress one by their recurrence and universality. Another cut is between a quantitative-statistical approach, and a qualitative-impressionistic-global approach. The latter is sometimes valuable because experienced observers can provide insights that inadequate statistical sampling cannot. The circularity of inadequate baseline and reporting data is perpetuated in every domain of MDTA. In addition to problems of sample size and reliability of data, the degree of localism is important. Thus, national studies obscure many important details. There have been few state studies and the truly local attempts have been either fragmentary or highly biased.

The Study in Prospect and Retrospect

Inasmuch as this introductory chapter is written at the conclusion of the study and yet attempts to convey the planning and preparatory flavor, the feeling, the hopes, the expectations as the operational phase began, it is inevitable that we juxtapose intentions and plans with the reality of subsequent events. It is instructive, for example, to cite at this point the "expected outcomes and implications" from our Plan for Evaluation, submitted in May 1968.

> While certain limitations of budget and of available data impose limitations on outcomes, it is expected nevertheless that a comprehensive review of the total program will be effective in several ways. First of all, the very process of evaluation should be helpful to all participants as a stimulus to self-examination; especially, an independent evaluation should result in cross-fertilization of perceptions and viewpoints. Second, it should produce data which go beyond rumor, intuition and impression. Third, the fleshing-out of statistical data should invest further meaning to sometimes sterile summary figures and tables. Fourth, a focus on actual instructional content and method should help in the improvement of training programs. Finally, the opportunity to compare stated goals and actual achievements should help in the goal-setting and the implementation areas.

In retrospect, the above was a worthwhile goal and has probably been accomplished to a great extent. However, the degree to which and the reasons why the outcomes and expectations were not met should be most instructive to all those concerned with manpower evaluation.

It may be seen that we have good reason to disclaim this as an "Evaluation" and instead refer to it as a careful but limited "Study," but which should nonetheless contribute to more penetrating evaluative research.

CHAPTER II

AN OVERVIEW OF MDTA IN NEW YORK STATE

Public Law 87-415, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, was one of the principal federal responses to what appeared, at that time, to be galloping unemployment caused by technological displacement and other structural factors.[1] The legislative intent was to identify workers who had lost their employability because their skills had become obsolete and to retrain them in demand skills. As a retraining program in an expanding economy, MDTA apparently achieved a high measure of success as will be seen below. But as early as 1963, the program began to acquire a new emphasis as part of the nation's effort to combat poverty. As an existing and apparently successful job-oriented institution, MDTA was a logical choice for this new role, and, since employment/employability is seen as a vital component of the poverty cycle, it was expected that, in time, MDTA would evolve into a major anti-poverty agency.

In New York State the manpower problems, the poverty problems, and their interactions, are quantitatively and qualitatively more complex and more serious than they are almost anywhere else. Furthermore, New York State has been officially responding to these problems for a longer period of time than most other states and its adult education, basic education, and vocational education systems have been highly regarded. Thus, for New York State, MDTA represented essentially an extension of existing efforts and not a radically new departure.

---

[1] It may be that the problem to which MDTA was addressed in 1962 had already peaked in 1961, the year in which many of the categories of unemployed persons (e.g., white and nonwhite females) reached post-war highs. It may also be that technological displacement in an expanding economy results in unemployment that is more nearly frictional than structural. This would imply that the most appropriate cost-effective government response should be the classical one of income maintenance during the period of readjustment, with private employers left to bear the retraining costs later. Although the issue has been rendered moot by events, it may help account for the gradual shift in emphasis.

At several points, efforts have been made to evaluate the impact of the MDTA effort and an on-going feedback system has been devised by the federal sponsor. But, by and large, previous studies have been inconclusive for reasons detailed below and there is, as yet, no comprehensive analysis of the feedback data. Thus, when the present study was undertaken, the New York University team collected an extensive amount of literature and data on MDTA in New York State as well as nationally. The original purpose of this collection was to provide the team with an understanding of what had gone before, what was known, and what techniques had proved successful. Further, it was intended to submit a critical review of this literature as part of the basis for the present study. For the most part, however, it was found that the evaluative work done to date has been disappointing.

To some extent, the term "evaluation" itself is misleading. Until recently, it was widely believed that the long-range and somewhat abstract objectives of educational and other social systems did not readily lend themselves to scientific evaluation. However, as the federal government gradually assumed more and more financial responsibility for such programs in the early 1960's, it began to insist upon provision for evaluation and it began to fund large-scale evaluative studies of various programs. Although this policy met with initial resistance, it is now well established even if the techniques of evaluation are not. For, developments in the evaluative art have been tentative and researchers have approached evaluation problems from widely varying points of view. These range from the cost-effective and cost-benefit approaches of operations research people to the anecdotal, case-history approach of some social scientists.

Description of the Literature

The evaluative literature is not really a body of literature in the usual academic sense. Rather, it is a disparate collection of isolated studies, periodic reports, and occasional data banks which have been gathered together for the first time here. To be sure, there is an important and growing literature on manpower policy and programs in general, but much of this remains global and does not extend down to the state or program level. Except for brief commentary in some of the studies cited below, there is almost no interpretive analysis on the status or progress of MDTA in New York State.

Thus, the present review has been confined to four main sources of data, each of which will be described briefly here.

Operations

This bulletin is the monthly publication of the Research and Statistics Office, Division of Employment, New York State Department of Labor. Its principal interest is in the monthly operating statistics of the Employment Service but it also publishes a monthly series of tables on certain aspects of MDTA. Specifically, these include monthly and cumulative activity statistics (number of referrals, GATB tests administered, program completions, etc.) and monthly listings of courses started and finished.

Activity statistics are, of course, important indicators of program status but, from a program planning point of view, they are almost meaningless. There is no way, for example, to draw meaningful inferences from total raw enrollment and completion data. There is no indication of what kinds of trainees are enrolling in and completing what kinds of courses. Thus, the data in Operations reflects the needs of the Employment Service and has only peripheral interest to the operational elements of MDTA.

Federal Reporting System

One of the basic sources of operational data should be the Federal Reporting System consisting of Department of Labor Forms 101 (Registration), 102

(Termination), and 103 (Follow-up). Unfortunately, Form 103 has been operational for about one year and there has been no published tabulation of its results. Form 102 has been in use somewhat longer but has a history of poor reporting. A summary of trainee characteristics was prepared from Form 101 data and is used extensively in this report.

OE Form 4021

This is the basic program reporting form of the federal Office of Education and the data from these forms were made available to New York University on punched cards. Unfortunately, the cards contain an unacceptable amount of error for the purposes of statistical analysis. Specifically:

1. More than 20 percent of the data fields were blank on the punched cards, reflecting blanks in the original documents. Many of the blanks involved critical sections such as Columns 16–18 and 19–24 which identify the occupation trained for.
2. Almost 10 percent of the cards contained shifts of data to the right of the appropriate column. This, of course, was a keypunch error systematic enough to avoid detection.
3. The deck delivered to New York University contained 42 cards (10 percent) which could not be identified as part of the MDTA data.
4. Nearly 18 percent of the cards contained illegal entries in columns 52 through 70. Together with errors in columns 38–39, this made it impossible to easily separate program from section cards.

Although most of the error could have been handled through the use of editing routines, it was decided to forego this in view of the prohibitive expense and the small amount of information likely to result from a reduced deck.

It should be pointed out that the 4021 reporting form is basically inefficient, at least from a research point of view. First, the form itself contains substantive problems: it gives enrollees but not completers; it contains no demographic data except sex; and, at the same time, cards derived from the form need 20 columns for precise dates and 9 columns for two different occupational codes, all of which are non-arithmetic and unprocessable. The Education Department should consider the possibility of having the forms submitted either before and after or only after training and should redesign them in terms of needed outputs.

Labor Department Studies

From time to time, the State Department of Labor has conducted studies of the output of the MDTA program in New York State and two of these studies have been published and are reviewed herein. The first and more ambitious of these was the 1967 Cost-Benefit Study; the second was the 1968 Survey of Accomplishments. These two studies were the only state-wide evaluative studies located and, as such, are discussed more fully later in this report.

MDTA and the Economy of New York State

Basically, MDTA is one of the tools the government employs in an effort to exercise some control over the labor market component of the economy. Thus, in order to evaluate it meaningfully, it is first necessary to place it in the perspective of economic conditions in general and labor market characteristics in particular.

Since MDTA is first a training program, presumably it should be oriented toward the labor market of the immediate future. Since it has also acquired a strong social action complexion in light of its post-1962 amendments, it would also be expected that the longer-range interests of its clients would be reflected in its planning and operation. Thus, in this section of the report, an effort is made to elicit from the nature of the economic environment in which its trainees are likely to find themselves basic criteria by which MDTA may be evaluated.

The economy of New York State is prosperous and delicately balanced. Both of these characteristics arise from the fact that New York State's economy is probably the most diverse and dynamic of any comparable area. Diversity and dynamism imply constant change and, in New York State, this can be seen reflected in a largely unstable labor market, especially at the lower levels of concern in this study. Specifically:

- New York State and, particularly, New York City which accounts for about half the state's people and 60 percent of its non-agricultural jobs, have a high concentration of labor intensive industries (roughly, industries in which labor costs are high in proportion to capital invested, such as the garment industry). From a labor market point of view, these industries are highly unstable; they are characterized by low wages, high turnover, and mass dislocations caused by the movement of plants to lower wage areas.[1]
- Another large segment of New York State's industrial mix consists of medium skill white collar operations not tied down to plant (as the automobile industry is tied down to the Detroit area) or markets. Except for the labor supply problems which becomes less critical in the face of advancing automation, many of these companies have little incentive to stay in New York State with its high taxes and decaying cities.[2]
- Many of the basic industries in New York State, such as the construction and maritime trades, are dominated by strong, conservative labor organizations. Through their control of the apprenticeship system,

---

[1] Economic Characteristics of the New York Labor Market: 1967, (The New York Council of Economic Development, New York, 1968), Chapter 3.

[2] Ibid.

these unions have been able to maintain the labor supply at an artificially low level and have successfully excluded various individuals and groups from the labor market. Of course, discrimination in any aspect of employment on the bases of age, sex, race and the like is illegal under federal, state and local (New York City) Fair Employment Practices acts. However, because labor unions have traditionally been held exempt from anti-trust provisions, they have, in some cases, been able to exercise "monopoly" power in the labor market through their control of apprenticeship programs and other entry paths. In some industries, de facto discrimination has reached such proportions that the federal Department of Labor has initiated administrative regulations requiring set percentage ranges for the hiring of "minority craftsmen" on federally assisted construction projects.[1] The absence of a free market in the labor sector has important consequences for the economy, contributing to high wages and high costs both directly and indirectly.

- Another significant group of employers of the minimally skilled consists of the large and generally conservative members of the financial industry. Until very recently, it was widely observed that Negroes were not hired by the downtown insurance companies in New York City, and one almost never saw a black bank teller outside the ghettoes. Such forms of overt discrimination are fast disappearing in New York State but other, more subtle ones remain.[2] One of these is the prevalence of standardized and non-standardized tests in personnel hiring.[1] It has become fairly clear in recent years that almost all such tests contain an inherent cultural bias which operates against minority group members. The point of all this is that any kind of systematic discrimination impinges on the freedom of the labor market causing it to become artificially "tight" for everybody. This encourages both unemployment and inflation.

---

[1] The New York Times, July 9, 1969, p. 24.

[2] Cf., Discrimination and Low Incomes: Social and Economic Discrimination Against Minority Groups in Relation to Low Incomes in New York State. Prepared by the New School for Social Research for and published by the New York State Interdepartmental Committee on Low Incomes, 1967. Although already somewhat out-of-date, this study remains the best overall consideration of the economic impact of overt employment discrimination in New York.

- Equally important are the labor market characteristics not present in New York State. For one thing, there is relatively little heavy industry in the developing technologies such as aero-space. Because of rapidly expanding needs and strong pressure for the advancement of the state of the art, these industries are forced to absorb the high costs of training and up-dating the skills of their employees more readily than in more traditional industries. Further, they are more willing, usually, to take less skilled entry level employees as training risks.[2]

It should not be inferred from the foregoing that there are no stable elements in the economy of New York State. Certainly, the optical industry and its spin-offs in the Rochester area are an effective rejoinder to such an idea. Rather, the thesis being pursued here is that, by its very nature, the economy of this state generates considerable frictional instability in the labor market. With this in mind, it is now possible to examine the size and distribution of that market.

---

[1] Cf., James J. Kirkpatrick, et al. Testing and Fair Employment. New York University Press, 1968.

[2] Cf., Training Activities by Type of Training, Cost of Training and SIC (Research Monograph of the American Management Association, 1968). Data presented in this paper support the conclusion given above in terms of total budget for training compared to total annual budget and per capita expenditure for training at every employment level. (SIC = Standard Industrial Classification).

New York State currently provides jobs for approximately 8 million persons, distributed according to the categories given in Table 2.1.

TABLE 2.1

Number of Jobs Available and Number of Persons Employed in New York State, 1960–1970

	Jobs Available		Persons Employed	
Category	1960	1970	1960	1970
Manufacturing	1,951,200	1,921,600	1,878,700	1,866,200
Durables	851,700	897,800	817,700	876,900
Non-durables	1,099,500	1,023,800	1,061,000	989,300
Non-manufacturing	5,313,800	6,155,300	5,135,000	6,209,700
less farm jobs	5,139,100	6,049,600	5,125,500	6,196,700

Source: Manpower Directions New York State: 1965–1975, prepared by the New York State Department of Labor, Division of Research and Statistics, Albany, 1968. Material in this table derived from data presented in Tables 1B and 1C.

The trends in Table 2.1 are clear enough:[1]

- The net expansion of jobs available (811,900) is more than keeping up with the population increase. Jobs are increasing at a 10-year rate of about 12.5 percent and the equivalent figure for population according to the 1967–68 Bureau of the Census Projection, is approximately 10.4 percent.
- The total number of persons employed is similarly compatible with the population increase.
- The long-range pattern of shift toward non-manufacturing seems to be confirmed in spite of a modest increase in the durable category.

---

[1] The whole question of jobs available vis a vis persons employed is beclouded by the number of inter- and intra-state commuters, by the number of persons holding two or more jobs (nearly 5 percent of the workers in New York State), and by the number of people employed full or nearly full-time as temporaries. The two projections given in Table 2.1 were generated from different sets of data based on slightly different definitions so the minor discrepancies are reasonable.

Thus, the employment outlook for the immediate future is unclear, at least in its broad implications. On a more specific level, by jobs or by occupational clusters, the outlook is more predictable and will be considered in detail in the next chapter.

The other side of the employment coin is unemployment and, again, New York State offers a number of problems which, if not unique, are at least substantially different by virtue of their magnitude.

- Because of the relatively high rates of public assistance and the ready availability of other municipal services, there has been an influx of under-educated, unskilled, and inexperienced workers, particularly into New York City. At least partially related to this has been an exodus of skilled workers, particularly out of New York City.
- As would be expected, the new arrivals tend to remain unemployed and the universe of unemployed persons tends to be composed largely of a "hard core" of long term unemployed persons drawn from among the most recent arrivals. There are many reasons for this, among them:

  Existing employment opportunities for such people are almost exclusively entry level positions in labor intensive industries.

  Wages in such jobs are not substantially different from basic welfare levels; in fact, an Aid-to-Dependent-Children family of four grosses $18 per week more than the worker at the minimum wage.

  Further, the career possibilities of such jobs are minimal and, altogether, there is little incentive for people to accept such employment.

  New York City is a magnet for young, well-educated people, especially females. Often, such people are willing to work in

> relatively low-paying jobs in so-called "glamor" fields. Their presence in this part of the labor market tends to artificially inflate the expectations and requirements for many of the important, cross-industrial occupations.

In closing, it should be noted that there is no really good published study of the unemployment characteristics of the New York State labor market by occupation or industry. Bureau of Labor Statistics data is published by industry but not by occupation and tends to cover statistical rather than geo-political areas. There is a series of studies done by the Bureau of the Census but it was a national survey and is now out-of-date. There are a number of "inside" studies done by and/or for various labor or management groups but these tend to be treated as state secrets. The New York Urban Coalition is presently analyzing unemployment and sub-employment in the New York Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area but the results will not be available for some time. Thus, the conclusions offered in the preceding discussion represent interpretations of data found in two sources.[1]

---

[1] U.S. Bureau of the Census, County Business Patterns, 1967: New York, CBP-67-34. United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1968. County-based data will be found in Table 2, pp. 21–184 and SMSA data, used here for New York City, in Table 3, p. 187f.

New York [State] Department of Labor. Jobs 1960–1970: The Changing Pattern. Albany, 1960.

CHAPTER III
ANALYSIS OF EXISTING DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to examine and analyze the literature and data concerning the MDTA training population. As has been indicated, the target population mandated by Congress has been becoming progressively more "difficult" in the programmatic sense almost from the beginning. Amendments to the legislation have directed the states away from the traditional retraining populations and toward the younger, the older, and the more disadvantaged groups. In every way, these changes have increased the challenge to MDTA for these groups tend to be more alienated, less motivated, and harder to train and place in the economic mainstream than were people who had worked all their lives.

Towards the Development of Evaluative Criteria

A basic question is the extent to which a program serves the population at which it is aimed. First, of course, it must reach the right groups, and, then, it must render the service in a manner that does not alienate the clients. In the case of MDTA, for example, it would be expected that more and more of its trainees would be drawn from pockets of the "hard core unemployed." Although this term is difficult to define, it suggests operationally that there will be increasing proportions of non-whites who have family responsibilities and who, at the time of their enrollment, are receiving some form of public assistance. In this regard, it is important to point out that, unlike most other agencies, MDTA training programs do not have control over their total operations but must depend to a large extent on the activities of outside groups for recruitment and referral work. Although in some locations advertising is used, most trainees come through State Employment Service or anti-poverty agency channels.

The second evaluative question in this area is the extent to which the program successfully enrolls and retains those assigned to it. Here, though, there are two complex problems:

- First, the program admittedly is designed for people who present the highest educational risks. Typically, they are individuals who have already failed in and have been failed by the traditional educational system. This initial failure has then been repeated in other contexts until there is little room for rational hope of success. Therefore, there is no actuarial basis for evaluating MDTA by its retention rates and no way of knowing what is good performance. At the same time, retention is a crucial matter because enrollment represents a new, probably skeptical but nonetheless real act of faith in society's institutions, an act accompanied by what may be the individual's first recent expression of hope. Failure at this point could well be final and tragic for both the individual and society.
- At the same time, it is not always possible to equate dropout rate with failure. Some trainees drop out for what they (and society) consider good reasons—for example to take a particular job opportunity. Some drop out for neutral, non-program related reasons such as pregnancy. At this time, there is no way to sort out these reasons statistically or logically. Within a short time, it is hoped that the federal reporting system will be in reliable operation and will provide some satisfactory rationale for interpreting dropout rates.

Description of the Population

As Table 3.1 indicates, from its inception in mid-1962 through the end of November, 1968, 84,414 persons were referred to MDTA institutional training

TABLE 3.1

Number of Referrals, Enrollments, Completions and Jobs Obtained in MDTA Institutional Training Programs in New York State by Year: 1962–68

Period	Referred	Enrolled	Completed
5/62 – 12/63	5,853	5,076	1,794
CY 1964	8,678	7,651	4,318
CY 1965	12,918	12,182	6,483
CY 1966	18,821	17,317	5,353
CY 1967	17,922	12,690	12,967
CY 1968*	20,222	11,882	7,323
TOTALS	84,414	66,798	38,238

*1968 figures complete through November 30.

Source: Cumulative statistics in Operations, Research and Statistics Office, Division of Employment, New York State Department of Labor.

programs in New York State. 66,798 or 79 percent of these were actually enrolled; of the remaining 21 percent, some were probably placed directly on jobs, some were not eligible, and some never showed up at the training center. Of the enrollees, 38,238 persons, or approximately 57 percent, completed the program. To this number must be added the unknown number of persons still in training on November 30, 1968, who eventually completed the program. If we assumed hypothetically that no new trainees were admitted to the program after November 30, 1968, and that all current enrollees completed training, the completion/enrollment ratio would be 64:36.

At the time this is being written, it is impossible to make firm evaluative judgments about what appears to be a 36 to 43 percent dropout rate.

The dropout issue is, of course, a vital one which will have to be resolved at the earliest possible time. The state should probably make a concerted effort to improve its 102 and 103 performance and should set up a system to monitor the output of these forms. In such an effort, it is not adequate to simply determine the category checked on Form 102 for a trainee may be quite defensive at the time of termination. The difficulty with Form 103, of course, is that it is often impossible to locate people after they have left a program. It may be that a special study could be designed expressly for the purpose.

In addition to the magnitude of the trainee population, its demographic composition is also of importance. There are two basic sources of information in this area: (1) a special analysis conducted by the New York State Department of Labor for the 1967 Cost-Benefit study, and (2) an analysis of New York Registration forms conducted by the federal Department of Labor. The comparison of these two sets of data presented in Table 3.2 is illustrative of the general problem encountered throughout this report.

The most obvious finding is the discrepancy between the two sets of figures given. To some extent, this may be explained by the fact that the federal figures are for the indicated fiscal years while the State figures are for calendar years. Thus, new trends should appear first in the federal data although in the one fairly clear case, sex distribution, the recent decrease in the percentage of males, the federal trend seems to lag the state by at least eighteen months. Another possible source of error would be slightly different definitions of terms in such areas as race although, presumably, both agencies were working with the same raw data. In short, it is apparent that, given the present state of reporting, it is very nearly impossible to make meaningful statements about even such an elementary characteristic as sex distribution. Thus, the interpretations offered below should be viewed cautiously, more as informed guesses than as statistically sound inferences.

TABLE 3.2

Demographic Characteristics of the MDTA Institutional Population, 1962–1968: Comparison of Two Sources

Characteristic	1962/3	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968
Age						
% ‹19	**8**	**19**	**20**	**17**	**21**	
	5	*10*	*20*	*19*	*23*	*19*
% 19–44	**78**	**71**	**71**	**74**	**68**	
	82	*77*	*71*	*73*	*70*	*73*
% ›44	**15**	**9**	**9**	**9**	**10**	
	13	*13*	*9*	*8*	*8*	*8*
Sex						
% Males	**47**	**51**	**54**	**53**	**49**	
	51	*52*	*52*	*54*	*58*	*54*
Race						
White:Nonwhite	**66:34**	**61:39**	**47:53**	**38:62**	**56:44**	
	75:25	*62:38*	*56:44*	*40:60*	*47:53*	*46:54*
Education						
% ‹12 years	**41**	**49**	**57**	**64**	**63**	
	39	*45*	*51*	*60*	*66*	*66*
Economic Indices						
% Allowance Eligible	**47**	**52**	**71**	**83**	**85**	
	55	*46*	*61*	*72*	*80*	*81*
% Receiving Public Assistance Prior to Enrollment	**8**	**10**	**11**	**13**	**14**	
	6	*9*	*10*	*11*	*14*	*16*

Notes: Figures in bold face were taken from the 1967 Cost-Benefit study. Figures in *italics* are from an analysis of registration forms provided by the federal Department of Labor. All figures are rounded percentages. In the case of age, sub-categories of the State data were combined to make them compatible with the federal categories.

- Non-white representation in the institutional program expanded steadily from 1962 until 1966 when the proportions had been reversed. In 1967, there was a reversal of this trend which may have been occasioned by the temporary cutback in institutional funding that year in favor of increased emphasis on On-the-Job Training (OJT). Since its inception, as indicated in Table 3.3, the OJT component has been essentially a white program, probably for reasons beyond the control of MDTA—perhaps, for example, employers are unwilling, for one reason or another, to risk hiring unskilled workers on an OJT basis and non-whites are generally the most unskilled people in this population. It may also be that employers find it more profitable to hire minority group members under other subsidized programs.
- Males have constituted a fairly consistent half of the institutional population from the beginning. This is somewhat in excess of the usual experience of poverty programs where males are usually in a sharp minority because they are much more difficult to recruit. A breakdown of sex by race would be useful in determining the kinds of social and cultural factors operating on enrollment but such data is not currently available.
- The institutional trainees have been drawn from progressively more deprived segments of the population as indicated by the gradual increase in public assistance recipients, and have been more needy in the absolute sense as indicated by the increasing proportion of primary wage earners. Again, the tapering off in 1967 is undoubtedly a reflection of the OJT emphasis in that year. The fact that there has been a dramatic increase in the proportion of enrollees found to be allowance-eligible is seen principally as a reflection of more liberal allowance standards and interpretations.

TABLE 3.3

Demographic Characteristics of the MDTA OJT Population, Cumulative Figures: Comparison of Two Sources

Characteristic	Cost-Benefit Study[1]	Federal Data[2]
Age		
% < 19	*	15
% 19–44	*	72
% > 44	*	13
Sex		
% Males	*	73
Race		
White:Nonwhite	69:29	67:33
Education		
% < 12 years	49	54
Economic Indices		
% Allowance Eligible	12	17
% Receiving Public Assistance Prior to Enrollment	6	7

*Data not given in source.

[1] Cumulative through December 1967.

[2] Cumulative through June 1968.

Sources: Evaluation and Benefit-Cost Relationships of Manpower Training Programs in New York State. New York State Department of Labor, October 1967; U.S. Office of Education.

- The proportion of institutional enrollees not having a high school diploma appears to be increasing at very rapid rates. When this is considered in the light of the numerous General Educational Development (GED) programs operating in the State to reduce the total number of non-high-school graduates, this becomes an especially impressive accomplishment.

A popular theory of poverty program operation contends that the needy population is defined by concentric circles of need with the least needy outer rings being easiest to attract into the program. The theory has it that word filters down through these rings, eventually reaching the most needy members of the "hard core." If this is the case, MDTA is running true to form for it is clear that its enrollees are measuring consistently more needy than before.

Analysis of Programs

In this section of the report, the subject is the program itself considered as the set of operations or treatments by means of which trainees' employability is increased. Process evaluation is always the most difficult to justify and, as might be expected, there is almost no relevant literature on process in New York State. There are a few reports of individual efforts to evaluate classroom instruction or the adequacy of support services but these are confined to single training centers and single slices of time. In fact, the lack of exactly this kind of information was one of the basic motivations for the New York University project; and some of the process issues are considered in Chapters IV–VII.

At the present time, there is little or no information on the following categories:

- Curriculum,
- Instructional adequacy, or even instructional methods,

- Qualifications of instructors,
- Qualifications of support personnel,
- Use of non-professional assistance, or,
- Availability of ancillary services.

The information which is available limits the present consideration to economic adequacies of the instructional offerings in terms of the labor market conditions outlined above and the costs of those offerings.

An important evaluative question concerning program that can be responded to in the context of existing data is the degree to which the training offered relates to the needs of the trainees and the realities of the labor market. The statement itself betrays an element of compromise; in an ideal world no one would be consigned through training to be a bank guard, which is, after all, a dead end job, or a keypunch operator whose skills are bound to become obsolete sooner than later. But bank guards and keypunch operators are in demand and are, therefore, paid a living wage. And, it is relatively easy to train them.

It should also be stressed that an effective MDTA program would assign its trainees to its courses in a selective manner. In terms of available training and available jobs, there are levels of need which should be a prime consideration. For example, a young man with heavy responsibilities should not be trained as a service station attendant just because that is the only course available. In New York, this should, theoretically, never be necessary because under Article 23A of the State Labor Law, funds can always be made available for individual training in special circumstances. In practice, however, the legislative appropriation for such "customized" training is small to the point of insignificance in most years. Nonetheless, the degree to which the program responds to the individual needs of its clients is an important measure of its value.

There ought to be some system for scaling the possibilities of different jobs and job training opportunities and for measuring them against the needs of a prospective trainee. In the absence of such a system, MDTA ought to provide a wide variety of training courses and ought to insure that they remain relevant to the demands of the labor market.

The Course Offerings

According to the special data analysis prepared for the 1967 Cost-Benefit study (p. 6), between 1962 and 1967 MDTA in New York offered institutional training in 235 occupations. Many of these "occupations" however seem to represent more differences in title than they do in actual job performed (e.g., clerk, general clerk). In other cases, there are recognized job differences but they are minor in terms of the job parameters (e.g., gas station attendant and garage assistant) of interest in a manpower context (such as salary and long-range career possibilities). Thus, it is probably most meaningful to put job titles into occupational clusters, combining for example, such titles as "Clerk, general," "Clerk," "File Clerk," and "Clerk/Typist" into a single clerical cluster.

Such a procedure, of course, entails difficulties of its own. For example, where should such titles as "Secretary" and "Stenographer" be placed? Is a "Medical Records Specialist" a clerical worker or a medical sub-professional? The solution to these questions is at best tentative but it seems reasonable to group occupations by the operations that distinguish them and by whether they are entry level or higher. Thus, because all kinds of "clerks" perform operations which are similar to each other and are, at the same time, observably on a lower level than the operations performed by secretaries, it seems appropriate to classify them together. Similarly, because the operations of a medical records specialist are those of a clerk and not of a hospital orderly or nurses' aide, he is classified in the clerical entry category.

Given such rough groupings, it becomes clear that training is not really given in 235 occupations but rather, in something closer to 50 occupational clusters.[1] Further, as the Cost-Benefit study found, three of these clusters predominate: clerical, automotive and health subprofessional. A pattern emerges which covers, according to Operations data, almost half the course offerings. Examination of these Operations data suggests that the MDTA curriculum may be becoming static.

Examining the lists of offerings in Operations, it becomes evident that, in the earlier years of the program, the curriculum was considerably richer and more imaginative than it was in 1968. One of the factors which helped to change this may have been the feeling that the new breed of trainees could not handle more exotic subject matter. But equally possible is that employers have discovered the advantages of custom training in other programs. Whereas MDTA used to have a course for Optical Mechanics in Rochester as recently as May, 1968, that kind of training has now passed directly to the companies concerned. Such a development is to the advantage of both the private company and the government but it should not result in government programs offering only the least desirable training operations. Exactly the opposite could prevail, with MDTA becoming an innovative force in the manpower field, developing new careers and new training techniques.

Costs

A traditional way to evaluate social programs is to examine their cost structures to determine what proportion of expenses is allocated to operational

---

[1] The source for these estimates is Operations which since January, 1968 has published the course titles of courses beginning and ending during the preceding month. These titles are grouped as indicated above and in Table 3.4. Obviously, the situation would be improved if courses were listed by D.O.T. (Dictionary of Occupational Titles) code.

TABLE 3.4

Summary of Occupations Trained For, 1968

	Started		Finished	
	N	%	N	%
TOTAL COURSES	266	100	334	100
Pre-Vocational	11	04	15	04
Clerical Entry	43	16	52	16
Health Entry	52	20	54	16
Auto Entry	27	10	40	12

versus administrative items and other such breakdowns. In the case of MDTA, (a) such data is not readily ascertainable, and (b) if it were available, it would probably show such a wide variation that it would be impossible to interpret.

The problems in determining educational costs and relating them to program performance are legion and there is partisan controversy at every step. Even the matter of direct labor is unclear. Should, for example, inservice teacher training be counted as a fringe benefit for the teacher, or an overhead item for the program? The difficulties become even greater when attempts are made to define and amortize capital costs or to add in "services-in-kind" in a matching grant situation. Finally, when program costs are charged against different budget centers involving different agencies, there is likely to be little agreement on even basic figures.

Given these perils, a particular program which is not shielded by its own accounting system and which is a readily identifiable budgetary item is vulnerable to oversimplistic analysis. MDTA is just such a program; it has an "annual budget" and a specificable number of enrollees and completers. Thus, even though expenditure patterns are not broken out, gross figures are available and are widely used in the literature with interpretations which seem to vary with the political position of the user. Among all these figures, the best are probably those used in the 1967 Cost-Benefit study which reported the cost-per-enrollee and the cost-per-completer for a large sample of Institutional and OJT programs. Table 3.5 is a summary of that data.

TABLE 3.5

Cost Estimates for a Sample of Institutional and OJT Training
Conducted by MDTA, 1966–67

	OJT		Institutional	
Cost Category	Mean	Range	Mean	Range
Per Enrollee	--	99 – 908	1605	302 – 7867
Per Completer	656	116 – 1378	2308	427 – 11235
Per New Employee	--	116 – 2610	--	--

Source: Evaluation and Benefit-Cost Relationships of Manpower Training Programs in New York State. New York State Department of Labor, October 1967.

In the heading above, the figures are referred to as estimates because they were derived by dividing total project costs by total student categories. This assumes, of course, that there is no carry-over from one project to the next, so the estimates tend to be somewhat on the high side. At first glance, it would seem obvious that OJT is less expensive than Institutional training. In fact, at one point in 1967, the government decided that this warranted an overhaul of MDTA with a major emphasis on OJT. However, despite the apparent cost differences in favor of OJT, comparisons are essentially meaningless. It has been thoroughly documented that OJT programs include much fewer hard-core, disadvantaged trainees, and therefore do not demand the same level of investment. Thus, it is not fortuitous that OJT remains a limited program component.

In the next section, the meaning of the cost figures given above will be further explored.

Outcomes

In the last analysis, every evaluation is most immediately concerned with the outcome or product of the program, and, in this respect, MDTA, for better or worse, is tied into a job framework. The MDTA program is supposed to give people the skills they need to get and hold decent jobs.

The State Follow Up Study

The most basic approach to program evaluation is to let the data speak for themselves and this has been the method of the on-going follow up survey being conducted by the State Department of Labor. The most recent report of that project was published in June, 1968, under the title: The Manpower Development and Training Act Institutional Programs: A Survey of Accomplishments in New York State. The method of the survey has been to follow up three random samples of program completers, all of whom completed training before December 31, 1964. Follow up is done at irregular intervals, the most recent apparently having been accomplished in June, 1967. A mailed questionnaire was sent out and there was an extraordinary return rate, averaging approximately 75 percent even after several years.

The basic findings of the Survey, summarized in Table 3.6, was that the early graduates of the program were able to find and, apparently retain jobs. The survey goes on to present an analysis of hourly earnings before and after training and one chart (Chart 4, page 7) purports to show that the overwhelming majority of completers had increased their hourly earnings by fifty cents or more. The implication seems to be that MDTA is responsible for this dramatic increase. In fact,

TABLE 3.6

Percentage of Survey Respondents Indicating They Were Still Employed On A Full-Time Basis

Survey Group	Percent Employed Full Time 90 days	 1 year	 2 years	 3 years	 4 years
1962/63 Graduates	72	66	75	74	77
1964 Graduates					
January through June	76	79	—	81	—
July through December	66	79	—	79	—

Source: The Manpower Development and Training Act Institutional Programs: A Survey of Accomplishments in New York State. New York State Department of Labor, June 1968.

some workers whose hourly pay rate increased actually lost ground in terms of purchasing power because of the Vietnam-spurred inflation of that period. In any event, surely there were other factors operating on the wages of these workers, including a twenty-five cents an hour increase in the State minimum wage.

Unfortunately, there is no indication given of the technical procedures used for the Survey. As a statistical report, the Survey raises more questions than it answers. Clearly there is an element of systematic bias in the figures in that those least likely to respond are those who are unemployed. The indicated return rates are indeed extraordinary and it would be interesting and important to discover exactly how they were generated. It would be helpful to be able to evaluate the validity of the responses since the respondents were required to react to highly complex terms. Most important, it would be interesting to learn just how the various samples were drawn. The lack of this knowledge invites the reader to suspect that the samples are not, in fact, representative.

The Cost-Benefit Study

In recent years there have been many attempts to apply the new management sciences to problems in the social sphere, a phenomenon rooted in the belief that American corporations are more systematically efficient than other human institutions. Among these new techniques, none has been more attractive to scientists seeking objective means of evaluating social programs than cost-benefit analysis which is a product of the Defense Department's efforts to put weapons procurement on a rational basis. The theory is elementary: strike a ratio between the anticipated costs and anticipated benefits of alternate systems and the system with the lowest ratio is the most efficient.

A major effort to apply this theory to MDTA was reported in October, 1967, under the title: Evaluation and Benefit-Cost Relationships of Manpower Training Programs in New York State by a State Department of Labor task force under the direction of M. P. Catherwood. In a very brief period of time, this task force collected and analyzed prodigious quantities of data and produced a document which remains the basic source on MDTA achievements in New York State. Their work has been extremely helpful in the present exercise and its findings have been liberally used throughout this report. Thus, no criticism of the task force should be inferred from the statement that, in terms of applying cost-benefit theory meaningfully to MDTA, it failed.

As was indicated in the previous section, there is no good way of apportioning costs in an educational program, especially capital costs. The task force did not solve this problem but rather relied upon the same simplistic division of total budget by total completers used in this report. Because different school districts have different fiscal structures and because new programs always produce widely different capital expenditure requirements, the cost side of the analysis cannot be regarded as either valid or reliable.

More important, the authors did not solve the problem of how to measure the benefit side. They wrote (p. 37):

> For each completed program, effectiveness is measured in terms of the number of persons who entered training, the number who successfully completed training, and the number who subsequently found employment either in a training-related job or in some other job.

The use of the term "effectiveness" betrays a certain ambivalence the authors apparently shared toward the nature of their design approach. Cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness are two quite different things. A cost-benefit analysis is a determination of the cost-per-unit-good-outcome and is a power measure. "Benefit" is an outcome defined as such; it is merely a nominal classification with no statement made about either an absolute or a relative value of the benefit vis a vis other possible outcomes. A cost-effectiveness analysis, on the other hand, is a measure of the fiscal efficiency with which a given degree of outcome is produced. As will be seen below, no interval measurement of the benefit side was attempted until the very end of the study.

To return, then, to what is actually an attempt to count benefits, the authors themselves point out that the number of jobs obtained after training is, at best, a highly contaminated index of benefit (cf., p. 39) but, for the most part, that is all their data would permit. This, it should be stressed, yields a cost-per-benefit, not a cost to value of benefit ratio.

At the end of the report, an effort is made to determine from Social Security records the average annual earnings of a selected group of trainees one year before and one year after training and to use the difference as an interval measure of benefit.

For 25 selected institutional programs, there was a net gain of 84.8 percent in earned income and for 11 OJT contracts, there was a gain of 45.4 percent. Next, an effort was made to relate these projected gains one year out to training costs per completer. It was found that the Institutional programs yielded an

average of 53.5 cents increased earnings per training dollar invested and that the OJT contracts yielded $2.10 per dollar. If these figures are at all accurate, MDTA is one of the most successful investments of all time.

Clearly, however, there are problems in the data. First, Social Security records tend to underestimate income before training because of the higher probability that, prior to training, the trainee would be in a job not covered by Social Security. Second, the authors made the experimental error of attributing the entire effect to the treatment whereas, in the period covered, there was a rapidly expanding and inflationary economy.

In addition, it seems likely that many of the subjects were unemployed for all or part of the 12 months preceding training. Starting from no income, or even from a very low income, would render the two periods statistically incomparable.

All this points up the difficulty of applying cost-benefit on a post hoc basis. Ideally and theoretically, a group of subjects could be identified and their current incomes, including welfare, could be determined with great accuracy. These could then be translated into constant dollars and the group would then be randomly divided into experimental and control sections with the former being assigned to various MDTA "treatments." The constant dollar incomes of the two groups would then be monitored after training. Allowances would be made for the increased benefits involved in removing an individual from the welfare population and turning him into a taxpayer. From these data, reliable indices of cost-benefit could be calculated and MDTA components could be compared as to cost-effectiveness.

The desirability of such an approach to evaluation, however, is a subject that manpower and training specialists should consider very carefully. Applied to social situations, the technique is fraught with peril. For example, what may be socially cost-effective may not be beneficial to the individual's interests; OJT training of keypunch operators is a perfect example. It may simply be that cost-benefit analysis is not appropriate in the evaluation of complex, "soft" systems.

PART TWO

A STUDY OF THE MULTI-CENTER TRAINING PROGRAMS IN NEW YORK STATE

CHAPTER IV

DESIGN FOR STUDY OF THE MULTI-CENTERS

This chapter provides an outline of the methods and procedures used in studying the multi-centers of New York State. It is an overview of the field phase of the M.D.T. Study, which is presented in detail in the next three chapters. The basic model, the instruments and the actual collection of data are described herein. Throughout these chapters all data are dichotomized for New York City (NYC) and Other New York State (ONYS); and in many cases, by blue-collar and white-collar training programs, as defined in Table 4.2. As an introduction to the detailed findings, this chapter, then, summarizes the study sample which includes the centers and staffs thereof, on the one hand, and, on the other, selected groups of trainees that were currently on site in each of the centers visited. The centers include five under the jurisdiction of the New York City Board of Education, and the eight multi-centers located throughout the State: Albany, Binghamton, Nassau County (New Hyde Park), Rochester, Syracuse, Utica, and White Plains.

The Data Collection Framework

The procedure for data collection in the multi-centers featured as its core a module which would give a systematic, interrelated sample of data from each of the centers. The module consisted of:

1. Structured questionnaire-interviews with the top administrator on site responsible for the day-to-day operations of the center; one supervisor for each of the following areas: skills teaching, basic education, counseling; four skills teachers; one basic education teacher; one counselor.

2. Questionnaires administered to the trainees while their skills teachers were being interviewed.
3. Evaluation of the specific instructional and counseling facilities used by the skills teachers, basic education teachers and counselors who were interviewed; evaluation of the general center facility.

Due to the practicalities of scheduling and the availability of projects, it was not always possible to implement the procedure as conceived. For example, while we had designed samples of skills teachers and trainees representative of the occupational offerings funded during fiscal 1968, it was impossible to include some occupational areas since they were not offered during the data collection period. To a large extent, the limited number of occupational offerings was due to a long hiatus during which the multi-centers were awaiting re-funding. An evaluation of the samples we finally obtained suggests to us that they are representative enough in many cases to draw conclusions generalizable to the State MDT multi-centers as a whole (Tables 4.1 to 4.4). Where possible, we have drawn such conclusions. Where we felt it was not possible to generalize but that it was possible to identify trends which should be studied more systematically we have done so and, finally, we have not reported any conclusions in those instances where we felt quite sure neither generalization nor identification of trends were warranted.

The Instruments

Questionnaire-Interview Guides were developed for collecting data from center personnel. The items for these guides were an outgrowth of a review of the literature of related studies, staff evaluations of specific needs for this project, and new items constructed by senior staff members. To assure an appropriate sample size, we designed the instruments to serve as both an interview guide and a questionnaire which the subject could complete privately. This procedure also permitted us to collect data to fill some of the gaps found after the initial data collection.

Separate Interview Guides were developed for center administrators, skills teacher supervisors, basic education supervisors, counselor supervisors, skills teachers, basic education teachers, and counselors. All instruments had a core of items in common as well as items unique to a particular area of specialization.

Two types of Observation Guides were developed to evaluate facilities: a guide for evaluating the facility as a whole and a guide for evaluating the classrooms of instructors who were selected for personal interviews. The purpose of the facilities observation was not to evaluate the teaching process but to evaluate the plant facility.

Finally, a questionnaire was developed for group administration to current trainees. As with the other instruments, the trainee questionnaire was an outgrowth of a review of the literature, personal experiences of senior staff members, and staff evaluation of early drafts of the instruments.

Pre-Testing

After the instruments and methods of data collection were initially developed they were pre-tested in January of 1969 at two of the New York City centers. As a result of this experience, the instruments were modified and the final form developed for the formal data collection.

The Data Collection Schedule

Data were collected in the thirteen centers during March; most gaps in the data were completed in April. The two study teams, each headed by one of the present writers, consisted of three members: a team leader who usually interviewed the center administrator, supervisors, and some professional staff members; an experienced occupational educator who evaluated classroom plant facilities, general center facilities, and conducted interviews with professional staff members; and a research associate who administered group questionnaires to current trainees and also conducted interviews with professional staff members.

The Proposed Site Visit Schedule (Appendix B) was prepared in multiple copies in advance of each visit with minor modifications as needed. Typically, however, a one-day visit followed the basic outline.

TABLE 4.1

Number of Staff Members In Study Sample

Staff	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
Center Administrators	5	8	13
Skills Teacher Supervisors	4	11	15
Basic Education Supervisors	1	3	4
Counselor Supervisors	1	4	5
Skills Teachers	22	29	51
Basic Education Teachers	4	9	13
Counselors	5	7	12
Total	42	71	113

NOTE: Two skills teacher supervisors in NYC were city wide supervisors and two were acting as supervisors in their centers.

Eight of the skills teacher supervisors outside NYC had additional administrative responsibilities in other areas.

The basic education supervisor in NYC functioned as an assistant city wide supervisor.

The counselor supervisor in NYC was city wide supervisor.

γ

The Study Sample

The data that are reported in Chapters V and VI dealing with staff, facilities, and services are based largely on the interviews and questionnaires with staff members as summarized in Table 4.1. Several comments are in order. Although we did intend to have a larger New York City sample, to provide an even balance with the rest of the State, the slow pace of recycling during the study period was somewhat slower in New York City and our sample was therefore reduced. While no one category of personnel is very large, except for the skills teachers, we believe that tapping such a variety of sources was nonetheless illuminating.

Table 4.2 shows the distribution of the skills teachers into blue collar and white collar categories, a distinction which is useful throughout this study.

TABLE 4.2

Number of Blue Collar and White Collar Skills
Teachers In Study Sample

Teachers	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
Blue Collar	9	17	26
White Collar	13	12	25
Total	22	29	51

The blue collar skills courses include autobody repair, auto mechanics, electronics mechanics, food services, household appliance repairs, production machine operations, welding, and woodworking. All these occupations, except food services, are classified under Roe's[1] Group IV, Technology. Food services are classified under Group I—Services, according to Roe, but were judged to fit better in a blue collar than a white collar grouping.

---

[1] Anne Roe, The Psychology of Occupations, Wiley, New York, 1959.

The white collar skills courses include bookkeeping, business machine operation, clerk/typist, drafting, duplicating, licensed practical nurse, nurse/orderly, office occupations, sales, and stenography. All these occupations, except nurse/orderly and licensed practical nurse are classified under Roe's Group III, Organization. Licensed practical nurse and nurse/orderly are classified under Group I—Services, according to Roe, but were judged to fit better in a white collar than a blue collar grouping.

Table 4.3 presents a summary of the facilities visited and observed. Finally, Table 4.4 describes the trainees in the study sample: this group is dealt with in greater detail in Chapter VII.

TABLE 4.3

Number of Facilities Evaluated

	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
Blue Collar Classrooms	3	12	15
White Collar Classrooms	6	11	17
Basic Education Classrooms	3	4	7
Total Classrooms	12	27	39
General Plant Facilities	5	8	13

TABLE 4.4

Number of Trainees In Study Sample: Type of Training

	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
Blue Collar Occupational Training	46	207	253
White Collar Occupational Training	100	176	276
Total	146	383	529

CHAPTER V

THE SETTING AND RESOURCES: ADMINISTRATION, STAFF, AND FACILITIES

In this chapter we have attempted to cover certain aspects of the training process which are important determinants of program success. We refer to such factors as administration, supervision and planning; the nature of the staff; plant and facilities; provisions for staff training; staff attitudes; and finally, we present general staff recommendations for program improvement.

Administration, Supervision and Planning

In general, the data suggest that administration of and planning for the multi-centers are highly centralized at the Board of Education level. The primary role of center administrator seems to be that of implementer of policy promulgated from a higher level. While this is true of the State as a whole, New York City seems to be more highly centralized than the rest of the State. No doubt part of this stems from the fact that New York City is unique in that five multi-centers are under the jurisdiction of a single Board of Education while in the rest of the State there is one multi-center under each Board of Education.

Administration. Most center administrators appear dissatisfied with their limited roles as administrators in view of their actual responsibilities. When asked what changes in their roles would improve their effectiveness, they replied that they would like more autonomy, more involvement in top-level planning conferences, more freedom in dealing directly with community groups, more freedom in determining trainee assignments, and finally, that they would like to see more flexibility and greater discretion in the distribution of funds.

In New York City, the administration of skills training, basic education, and counseling is conducted by city wide supervisors. The city wide supervisors perceive themselves as having direct responsibility for the staff professionals in their respective areas, i.e., skills teachers, basic education teachers, and counselors. On the other hand, the center administrators have the same perceptions concerning their responsibilities for the very same staff. It seems that the situation involves a delegation of supervisory responsibility which is somewhat ambiguous and overlapping and a source of some dissatisfaction to both city wide supervisors and center administrators. In the other New York State centers, skills supervisors and counseling supervisors are all on-site in each of the multi-centers. The extent and limits of their responsibilities in relationship to the center administrators and to the Board of Education are considerably clearer.

Supervision. When asked what changes in their roles would improve their effectiveness, skills supervisors in New York City generally made no recommendations other than an expression of need for additional staff at their level. In centers outside of New York City, four skills supervisors indicated they were quite satisfied with their current roles. Two felt that they could become more effective if they were given more administrative responsibility.

Only two basic education supervisors, one from New York City, and one from a center outside New York City, responded to the question concerning changes in their roles which might improve their effectiveness. One indicated that there was a need for more black basic education teachers and the other felt that if basic education supervisors supervised vocational education teachers, it would improve articulation between basic education and skills instruction.

The city wide counseling supervisor for New York City stated that her situation had been ideal in the past when she had field supervisors reporting to her, with the clear indication that counseling supervision should be centralized at the city level rather than the center level. Three of the counseling supervisors outside of New York City were satisfied with their roles while a fourth reported that he would like to function more independently within the center with less direction from the center director.

Planning. When asked who planned and set up center projects, the five New York City center administrators all gave answers which made it quite clear that planning is primarily outside the center. However, four of the eight center administrators in the rest of the State indicated that they play a major role in planning and setting up projects. Apparently, New York City center administrators understand planning to be a responsibility of the central Board of Education while there is a split in how the other New York State center administrators view the planning function.

The conclusions concerning centralization and the lack of a major role for center administrators in planning were also verified in the responses to a second question in which we asked the center administrator to define his role in planning the center's program. Four of the five New York City administrators indicated very minor roles in planning, while a fifth indicated that he prepares plans for the Board of Education but that it is the latter's responsibility to approve these plans and make decisions concerning city wide policy. Four of seven center administrators outside of New York City indicated that they play minor roles in planning; three indicated that they prepare material for final review and negotiate with Albany themselves.

There was also a decided difference in the responses from skills teacher supervisors in New York City and skills teacher supervisors in the rest of the State concerning their roles in project planning. The New York City skills supervisors generally see their major planning roles as restricted to updating projects which had been submitted earlier. One gets the impression that, with few exceptions, most "new" projects reflect little new planning but are rewrites of projects previously approved. Skills teacher supervisors outside of New York City spoke of planning cooperatively with advisory committees or with their center staffs. While it might be that multi-centers outside New York City do not submit any more new projects than do New York City multi-centers, the point here is that the responses of New York City skills teacher supervisors reflect concern with the limits of their responsibilities which they perceive as considerable, while the responses of skills teacher supervisors outside of New York City focus on areas of their involvement in planning.

In New York City it was reported that the guidelines for the basic education program were set by the city wide basic education supervisor and modified in individual instances through consultation between the supervisor and the basic education staff in each center. A similar process is followed in centers outside New York City except that the complete planning and implementation is done within the center. Finally, the counseling program is planned at the city wide level in New York City and at the center level elsewhere.

Personal Characteristics of Center Staff

Personal characteristics are defined here as those unique attributes of individuals which transcend their particular jobs or occupational settings. In other words, they are descriptive of human beings without necessarily referring to work characteristics.

Age. There seems to be a state wide tendency to fill the positions of center administrator, skills teacher supervisor, and blue collar skills teacher with personnel who are over the age of forty (Table 5.1). Three of the 13 center administrators were less than forty years old while 10 were over the age of forty; 8 were over fifty.

TABLE 5.1

Personal Characteristics of Center Staff: Age

Staff	NYC		ONYS		Total		
	40 and Under	Over 40	40 and Under	Over 40	40 and Under	Over 40	Total
Center Administrators	2	3	1	7	3	10	13
Skills Teacher Supervisors	1	3	1	10	2	13	15
Basic Education Supervisors	1	–	2	1	3	1	4
Counselor Supervisors	–	–	3	–	3	–	3
Skills Teachers:	9	12	9	19	18	31	49
Blue Collar	*2*	*7*	*3*	*13*	*5*	*20*	*25*
White Collar	*7*	*5*	*6*	*6*	*13*	*11*	*24*
Basic Education Teachers	3	1	4	5	7	6	13
Counselors	4	1	4	2	8	3	11
Total	20	20	24	44	44	64	108

NOTE: There was no response from one each of following: NYC Counselor Supervisor, ONYS Counselor Supervisor, ONYS Counselor, NYC White Collar Skills Teacher, ONYS Blue Collar Skills Teacher.

Two of the 15 skills teacher supervisors were forty years old or younger while 13 were over the age of forty; 7 were over fifty. Only 18 of 49 skills instructors were forty years or younger. The disproportionality may be even greater when blue collar skills teachers are compared to white collar skills teachers: 20 of 25 blue collar skills teachers were over forty while 11 of 24 white collar skills teachers were over forty. A content analysis of the work experience of the blue collar skills teachers showed that the tendency to staff with those over forty years of age cannot be attributed to long years of experience as teachers in public schools since almost all of them had been recruited from business and industry. Counselors are an exception to the age distribution. Of the

11 counselors in the study sample, 8 were under the age of forty and 5 of these were thirty years of age or younger.[1]

While an argument might be made for staffing administrators and supervisors over the age of forty on the basis of experience and maturity, questions about age and generation gap need to be raised about the proportion of older people in trainee contact positions such as skills teacher, considering the high numbers of young trainees.

Sex. Our sample suggests that there may be an equal or larger proportion of males than females in all staff positions with the exception of basic education teacher and white collar skills teacher (Table 5.2). Only 3 out of 13 basic education teachers were male. Twenty-five of 26 blue collar skills teachers were male while 7 of 24 white collar skills teachers were male. The traditional association of "clean" (white collar) jobs with femininity and "dirty" (blue collar) jobs with masculinity, particularly in lower level jobs, might be reinforced in the minds of trainees if our sample is representative of the total staff of MDT. This matter should be examined further.

TABLE 5.2

Personal Characteristics of Center Staff: Sex

	NYC		ONYS		Total NYS		
Staff	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Total
Center Administrators	4	1	7	1	11	2	13
Skills Teacher Supervisors	2	2	8	3	10	5	15
Basic Education Supervisors	–	1	2	1	2	2	4
Counselor Supervisors	–	1	3	1	3	2	5
Skills Teachers:	14	8	18	11	32	19	51
Blue Collar	*9*	–	*16*	*1*	*25*	*1*	*26*
White Collar	*5*	*8*	*2*	*10*	*7*	*18*	*25*
Basic Education Teachers	1	3	2	7	3	10	13
Counselors	4	1	5	2	9	3	12
Total	25	17	45	26	70	43	113

---

[1] Our samples were not large enough to reveal meaningful trends for basic education supervisors, counselor supervisors, and basic education teachers.

Marital Status. Staff members in our sample generally tended to be married (Table 5.3), with supervisors of skills teachers a possible exception to the trend. Of the 26 single staff members, 11 were skills teachers, and yet the 11 represent a small proportion of the group of 47 skills teachers for whom we have data.

TABLE 5.3

Personal Characteristics of Center Staff: Marital Status

	NYC		ONYS		Total NYS		
Staff	Married	Single	Married	Single	Married	Single	Total
Center Administrators	4	–	6	2	10	2	12
Skills Teacher Supervisors	2	2	2	8	4	10	14
Basic Education Supervisor	–	–	3	–	3	–	3
Counselor Supervisors	1	–	1	2	2	2	4
Skills Teachers:	10	9	26	2	36	11	47
Blue Collar	*7*	*1*	*16*	*1*	*23*	*2*	*25*
White Collar	*3*	*8*	*10*	*1*	*13*	*9*	*22*
Basic Education Teachers	3	–	9	–	12	–	12
Counselors	3	1	6	–	9	1	10
Total	23	12	53	14	76	26	102

NOTE: No responses from:
1 ONYS Counselor Supervisor; 2 NYC White Collar Skills Teachers; 1 NYC Basic Education Teacher; 1 ONYS Counselor.
Distribution included: 3 divorced, 2 widowed, 1 separated.

Ethnic Background. Our data suggest that MDT staff may be predominantly white (Table 5.4). When the total sample is divided into center administrators and all supervisors in one group and trainee contact personnel in another, it is noted that 8 of 37 administrators and supervisors are black and 20 of 75 trainee-contact staff members are black.

TABLE 5.4

Personal Characteristics of Center Staff: Ethnic Background

Staff	NYC		ONYS		Total NYS		
	Black	White	Black	White	Black	White	Total
Center Administrators	4	1	–	8	4	9	13
Skills Teacher Supervisors	1	3	–	11	1	14	15
Basic Education Supervisors	–	1	1	2	1	3	4
Counselor Supervisors	1	–	1	3	2	3	5
Total Administration and Supervision	6	5	2	24	8	29	37
Skills Teachers:	12	9	5	24	17	33	50
Blue Collar	*3*	*6*	*3*	*14*	*6*	*20*	*26*
White Collar	*9*	*3*	*2*	*10*	*11*	*13*	*24*
Basic Education Teachers	1	3	–	9	1	12	13
Counselors	1	4	1	6	2	10	12
Total Trainee Contact	14	16	6	39	20	55	75
Total	20	21	8	63	28	84	112

NOTE: There was no response from 1 NYC White Collar Skills Teacher.

A further analysis of Table 5.4 suggests that the racial imbalance may be due primarily to a dearth of black staff members in centers outside of New York City. In the New York City centers, 4 of the 5 center administrators were black while all 8 of the center administrators in centers outside of New York City were white. When administrators are combined with all supervisors it is found that 6 of 11 administrators and supervisors in the New York City centers are black while only 2 of 26 are black in the eight centers outside of New York City. When skills teachers, basic education teachers, and counselors are combined in a trainee contact group, it is found that 14 of 28 staff members are black in the New York City centers while only 6 of 45 staff members are black in the eight centers outside of New York City.

Assuming that our random selection of staff members approximates the ethnic proportions that exist in the total MDT population in New York State multi-centers, an assumption highly likely for the administrative and supervising total, it would seem that New York City multi-centers are clearly more open to the employment of black staff, especially in top level positions, than is the case in multi-centers outside of New York City.

Educational Level. The usual relationship between educational level and occupational level was found to exist in the multi-centers in New York State (Table 5.5). Center administrators had higher levels of education than skills teacher supervisors. All 13 center administrators had baccalaureate degrees while 10 had attained masters degrees; 11 of the 15 skills teacher supervisors had attained baccalaureate degrees while 4 held the masters degree. Only 13 of the 51 occupational skills teachers had attained the baccalaureate degree and of these, only one held a master's degree. All 13 taught white collar subjects; none of the blue collar skills teachers had earned a baccalaureate degree. Nine of the 13 taught in New York City centers (Tables 5.6 and 5.7). Apparently it is rare for a blue collar skills teacher to hold a baccalaureate degree in a New York City center and for any skills teacher to hold a degree in a center outside of New York City. This trend suggests that perhaps there is a need to establish MDT teacher training, degree programs in institutions of higher learning in New York State.

It may be that basic education teachers, counselors, and counselor supervisors are required to have higher levels of education than those at comparable levels in the multi-centers. All 13 basic education teachers had attained the

TABLE 5.5

Personal Characteristics of Center Staff: Educational Level
Total, New York State

	DEGREE				
Staff	Associate	Baccalaureate	Masters	No Degree	Total
Center Administrators	–	3	10	–	13
Skills Teacher Supervisors	–	7	4	4	15
Basic Education Supervisors	–	2	2	–	4
Counselor Supervisors	–	–	4	–	4
Skills Teachers:	2	12	1	36	51
Blue Collar	*1*	–	–	*25*	*26*
White Collar	*1*	*12*	*1*	*11*	*25*
Basic Education Teachers	–	8	5	–	13
Counselors	–	2	9	1	12
Total	2	34	35	41	112

NOTE: There was no response from one Counselor Supervisor.

baccalaureate degree while 5 of them had attained the master's degree. Counselors and counselor supervisors had attained levels of education equalled only by the center administrator group. All four counselor supervisors had attained the master's degree while 9 of the 12 counselors held a master's degree. In view of recent innovations in the use of paraprofessionals in counseling roles, one wonders why this area specifically requires such a high level of education in the multi-centers.

It is of interest to note the areas in which the baccalaureate and master's degrees were attained by the staff. A content analysis indicates that center administrators obtained their degrees in fields such as vocational education, supervision and administration, guidance and counseling, etc. Skills supervisors tended to obtain their degrees in specific vocational education subject matter areas or in educational administration. Two of the four counselor supervisors had received their master's degree in counseling while one had received a master's degree in secondary education and the other a baccalaureate degree in education.

TABLE 5.6

Personal Characteristics of Center Staff: Educational Level
New York City

Staff	DEGREE Associate	Baccalaureate	Masters	No Degree	Total
Center Administrators	–	1	4	–	5
Skills Teacher Supervisors	–	2	1	1	4
Basic Education Supervisors	–	–	1	–	1
Counselor Supervisors	–	–	1	–	1
Skills Teachers:	2	8	1	11	22
Blue Collar	*1*	–	–	*8*	*9*
White Collar	*1*	*8*	*1*	*3*	*13*
Basic Education Teachers	–	3	1	–	4
Counselors	–	–	5	–	5
Total	2	14	14	12	42

Job Characteristics

Job characteristics are defined here as those factors which are necessarily related to the work positions held by the personnel interviewed.

Staff Recruitment. With very few exceptions, center administrators and supervisors throughout the State indicated that they had no difficulty in recruiting competent staff. Again, with very few exceptions, they felt that there was a problem in retaining competent staff members because of uncertainty in refunding

TABLE 5.7

Personal Characteristics of Center Staff: Educational Level
Other New York State

Staff	DEGREE Associate	Baccalaureate	Masters	No Degree	Total
Center Administrators	–	2	6	–	8
Skills Teacher Supervisors	–	5	3	3	11
Basic Education Supervisors	–	2	1	–	3
Counselor Supervisors	–	–	3	–	3
Skills Teachers:	–	4	–	25	29
Blue Collar	–	–	–	*17*	*17*
White Collar	–	*4*	–	*8*	*12*
Basic Education Teachers	–	5	4	–	9
Counselors	–	2	4	1	7
Total	–	20	21	29	70

NOTE: There was no response from one Counselor Supervisor.

projects. Most implied that if there were more funding stability they would have fewer staffing problems. They pointed out that to date they had been fortunate that lack of job security had been balanced by the dedication of the professional staff members whom they were able to recruit. Staff members seem willing to risk job security in order to attain a satisfying work environment, according to center administrators and supervisors. While this most certainly is true of some staff members it may be that in other cases, MDT teaching positions are the best possible if educational level is an indicator, particularly for skills teachers.

Apparently recruitment is somewhat more centralized in New York City than in centers outside New York City. Recruitment of staff in New York City is the responsibility of the Board of Education even though in some instances recruiting is done informally at the center level and final approval is granted by the central Board of Education. Four of the centers outside of New York City indicated that hiring power in practice rested at the center level and seemed to work well.

Staff Aides. Center administrators were asked the extent to which they employed aides. In New York City four center administrators responded to this question. The aides in these four centers were reportedly used primarily as interpreters, or as office assistants and switchboard operators. It was our impression that there were actually few aides available. Six of the seven center administrators outside of New York City for whom we had data indicated they did not have the use of aides. The one center that did utilize aides had a tool-cart attendant.

It seems apparent that there is practically no involvement of paraprofessionals in the multi-centers when their use as a major thrust of manpower development is receiving serious attention in health, education, and related fields.

Position Stability. Eight of the 13 center administrators had worked at their particular centers over two years; 5 of the 8 had been in their present centers for over three years (Table 5.8).

TABLE 5.8

Tenure At Center Where Interviewed: Center Administrators

Months	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
0 – 6	–	1	1
7 – 12	2	2	4
13 – 18	–	–	–
19 – 24	–	–	–
25 – 36	1	2	3
37 – 48	1	1	2
49 – 60	–	1	1
over 60	1	1	2
Total	5	8	13

Skills teacher supervisors had worked for longer periods of time at the centers where they were interviewed than had center administrators: 14 of the 15 skills teacher supervisors had been in their present centers over two years and 7 of the 14 had held their positions for over three years (Table 5.9). Three of the four basic education supervisors and four of the counselor supervisors for whom we had data on length of employment had held their current positions for two years or longer.

Thirty-three of the 50 skills teachers who responded had held their center positions for over two years; 15 of these had held their positions for over three years (Table 5.10). There were no discernible differences between New York City and the rest of the State and between blue collar and white collar teachers in length of tenure.

TABLE 5.9

Tenure At Center Where Interviewed: Skills Teacher Supervisors

Months	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
0 – 6	–	–	–
7 – 12	1	–	1
13 – 18	–	–	–
19 – 24	–	–	–
25 – 36	1	6	7
37 – 48	1	2	3
49 – 60	–	1	1
over 60	1	2	3
Total	4	11	15

TABLE 5.10

Tenure At Center Where Interviewed: Skills Teachers

Months	NYC Blue Collar	NYC White Collar	ONYS Blue Collar	ONYS White Collar	Total NYS Blue Collar	Total NYS White Collar	Total
0 – 6	1	1	1	—	2	1	3
7 – 12	1	3	3	1	4	4	8
13 – 18	—	—	—	1	—	1	1
19 – 24	—	2	2	1	2	3	5
25 – 36	3	2	6	7	9	9	18
37 – 48	2	3	3	2	5	5	10
49 – 60	—	1	1	—	1	1	2
over 60	2	1	—	—	2	1	3
Total	9	13	16	12	25	25	50

NOTE: There was no response from one Other New York State, Blue Collar Skills Teacher.

Only 5 of 12 basic education teachers had held their positions for over two years (Table 5.11) and only 2 of 12 counselors had held their positions for over two years (Table 5.12). As a matter of fact, 8 of the 12 counselors had held their positions for eighteen months or less. Counselor levels of education are higher than those of their colleagues in the multi-centers (most of them hold a master's degree), their salaries seem lower than salaries of counselors in other settings who have no higher levels of education, and fringe benefits which are lacking in the multi-centers are available in settings outside the multi-centers. It may be that counselors are in a better position than their MDT colleagues to find more suitable positions outside of the MDT setting. A more detailed study of MDT counselor vulnerability to turnover should be conducted.

Remuneration. Six of 12 center administrators responding had annual incomes which totaled less than $15,000 a year and 6 administrators received between

TABLE 5.11

Tenure At Center Where Interviewed: Basic Education Teachers

Months	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
0 – 6	–	1	1
7 – 12	1	2	3
13 – 18	1	2	3
19 – 24	–	–	–
25 – 36	2	1	3
37 – 48	–	2	2
49 – 60	–	–	–
over 60	–	–	–
Total	4	8	12

NOTE: There was no response from one Other New York State.

TABLE 5.12

Tenure At Center Where Interviewed: Counselors

Months	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
0 – 6	1	–	1
7 – 12	2	2	4
13 – 18	2	1	3
19 – 24	–	2	2
25 – 36	–	1	1
37 – 48	–	–	–
49 – 60	–	1	1
over 60	–	–	–
Total	5	7	12

$16,000 and $18,000 a year (Table 5.13). It would appear that salaries below $15,000 a year may be out of line with the responsibilities of an administrator of a multi-center which includes direction of the center's program and, in most cases, a sizeable staff, as well as responsibility for proper utilization of a large financial investment. In addition, the title "Teacher-in-Charge" for center administrators in New York City does not seem to be at all appropriate in view of the actual administrative responsibilities.

TABLE 5.13

MDT Income: Center Administrators and Skills Teacher Supervisors

	NYC		ONYS		Total NYS	
Annual Salary	Center Admin.	Sk. T. Sup.	Center Admin.	Sk. T. Sup.	Center Admin.	Sk. T. Sup.
$11–12,000	–	–	–	1	–	1
$12–13,000	–	–	1	5	1	5
$13–14,000	2	1	1	1	3	2
$14–15,000	–	–	2	1	2	1
$15–16,000	–	–	–	1	–	1
$16–17,000	1	–	2	1	3	1
$17–18,000	1	–	2	–	3	–
$8.25/hr.– $10.10/hr.	1	3	–	1	1	4
Total	5	4	8	11	13	15

Seven of 11 skills teacher supervisors reported receiving between $12,000 and $14,000 a year and one less than $12,000; three received salaries between $14,000 and $17,000 a year. These salaries would seem to compare favorably with comparable positions outside of MDT.

No analysis was made of the income of other professional staff members as they are paid at an hourly rate and it was not possible to obtain meaningful annual estimates due to the instability of their employment. However, it was quite clear that professional members were dissatisfied with the hourly pay rate and the lack of job stability involved. Although professional self-images were not investigated in this study, other research has documented that professionals tend to identify hourly wages with blue collar occupations and annual salaries with professional positions. It may be, then, that professional staff members find an hourly wage rate incompatible with their occupational self concepts. Certainly, this would be well worth investigating.

Staff Benefits. Staff benefits seem to be generally better outside New York City. The only typical employee benefits that seem available to New York City professional staff members in MDT centers is one day of salary for every twenty days of employment. There are no paid sick leave, medical insurance or retirement benefits. In the centers outside of New York City, 4 centers indicated that they provide health insurance, 4 centers provide teachers' retirement benefits, and 1 center provides one day a month of sick leave. However, it is our impression that while several centers outside of New York City provide better fringe benefits for employees than centers in New York City, overall fringe benefits for MDT multi-center staff members do not compare well with those in private industry or regular public school positions. It should be noted that higher wages sometimes compensate for this but it is difficult to evaluate overall compensation.

Job Satisfaction. Center personnel were asked three questions to arrive at their degree of job satisfaction. In response to the question "Are you satisfied with the structure and organization of your job here?" most center personnel replied "Yes" (Table 5.14).

TABLE 5.14

Job Satisfaction: "Are You Satisfied with the Structure and Organization of Your Job Here?"

Staff	NYC		ONYS		Total NYS		Total
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Center Administrators	2	2	7	–	9	2	11
Skills Teacher Supervisors	2	2	8	2	10	4	14
Basic Education Supervisors	–	–	3	–	3	–	3
Counselor Supervisors	–	1	2	1	2	2	4
Skills Teachers:	16	6	22	4	38	10	48
Blue Collar	*7*	*2*	*13*	*2*	*20*	*4*	*24*
White Collar	*9*	*4*	*9*	*2*	*18*	*6*	*24*
Basic Education Teachers	2	2	7	2	9	4	13
Counselors	3	3	7	–	10	3	13
Total	25	16	56	9	81	25	106

NOTE: There were no responses from 1 each of following:
NYC Center Administrator, ONYS Center Administrator, ONYS Skills Supervisor,
NYC Basic Education Supervisor, ONYS White Collar Skills Teacher;
also 2 ONYS Blue Collar Skills Teachers.

Both a yes and no answer were received from 1 NYC Counselor.

To determine if there might be some underlying job dissatisfaction, we further asked, "Do you have some frustrations in your work?" (Table 5.15). The most frequent response was "Yes." A content analysis of the responses indicated that most center administrators' frustrations had to do with the "system." They reiterated their feelings that a large proportion of their problems stemmed from cyclical funding. Another source of frustration had to do with their lack of autonomy and control over the kinds of projects that were set up and the initial assignment of trainees. A special problem in New York City seemed to be the inappropriateness of the title "Teacher-in-Charge." Supervisors echoed center administrators in complaining about problems related to cyclical funding and lack of control in the assignment of trainees to projects.

TABLE 5.15

Job Satisfaction: "Do You Have Some Frustrations In Your Work?"

Staff	NYC Yes	NYC No	ONYS Yes	ONYS No	Total NYS Yes	Total NYS No	Total
Center Administrators	4	–	7	1	11	1	12
Skills Teacher Supervisors	3	–	8	–	11	–	11
Basic Education Supervisors	–	–	3	–	3	–	3
Counselor Supervisors	1	–	3	–	4	–	4
Skills Teachers:	7	15	22	6	29	21	50
Blue Collar	*2*	*7*	*12*	*4*	*14*	*11*	*25*
White Collar	*5*	*8*	*10*	*2*	*15*	*10*	*25*
Basic Education Teachers	4	–	7	2	11	2	13
Counselors	4	–	6	1	10	1	11
Total	23	15	56	10	79	25	104

NOTE: There were no responses from 1 each of the following:
NYC Center Administrator, ONYS Skills Supervisor, NYC Basic Education Supervisor, ONYS Counselor Supervisor, ONYS Blue Collar Skills Teacher, NYC Counselor.
Also 3 ONYS Skills Teacher Supervisors.

At first glance, the responses indicated that skills teachers were more frustrated in other New York State centers than in New York City (Table 5.15). Such was not the case when a content analysis of the "Yes" responses for the skills teachers outside of New York City was made. Their comments tended to reflect involvement, sincerity and commitment in their jobs rather than a sense of frustration. There may be subtle differences between New York City skills teachers and those outside New York City which are reflected in their answers to this question. However, our design did not permit us to identify such differences if they do exist.

A third indicator of job satisfaction is to be found in answers to the question "Do you plan to stay in MDTA?" (Table 5.16). In most instances, respondents indicated they do plan to stay. Generally speaking, this should suggest that despite the problems and insecurities in MDT employment overall, they have not yet reached the point where they create serious job dissatisfaction. However, the fact that 4 of the 13 center administrators did not give an unequivocal "yes" suggests that top administrators may have some problems of job satisfaction that should be investigated.

Staff Training

This section deals with preservice and inservice training programs for staff, recommendations by MDT staff for improving training, and finally, the New York University recommendations.

Preservice Training. There is no formal organized preservice training program for staff in the state-wide multi-centers. In most instances it seems that existing preservice preparation is informal and quite limited. Generally, what respondents reported as preservice training was in reality brief, informal orientation to the center itself. New York City tends to provide one or two days of such orientation. One upstate center described a situation in which a new staff member came

TABLE 5.16

Job Satisfaction: "Do You Plan to Stay in MDTA?"

Staff	NYC Yes	NYC No	ONYS Yes	ONYS No	Total NYS Yes	Total NYS No	Total
Center Administrators	3	—	6	—	9	—	9
Skills Teacher Supervisors	2	2	11	—	13	2	15
Basic Education Supervisors	1	—	3	—	4	—	4
Counselor Supervisors	1	—	2	—	3	—	3
Skills Teachers:	20	1	23	2	43	3	46
Blue Collar	*8*	—	*12*	*2*	*20*	*2*	*22*
White Collar	*12*	*1*	*11*	—	*23*	*1*	*24*
Basic Education Teachers	2	2	8	1	10	3	13
Counselors	2	2	5	—	7	2	9
Total	31	7	58	3	89	10	99

NOTE: The following answered "don't know":
2 NYC Center Administrators; 2 ONYS Center Administrators; 1 NYC Blue Collar Skills Teacher; 1 NYC Counselor.

There were no responses from 1 each of:
ONYS Counselor Supervisor, ONYS White Collar Skills Teacher, 3 ONYS Blue Collar Skills Teachers, 3 ONYS Counselors.

to the center two weeks prior to beginning employment for conferences and observation at the staff member's own expense. One skills supervisor justified the orientation in lieu of preservice training by the fact that all the staff were already experienced teachers. Orientation generally consists of an explanation of the philosophy of the program, visitations to physical plant and facilities, and introduction to other staff members. The city wide counselor supervisor for New York City had just started a preservice training program on an experimental basis with a small group but the recent cutback in funds seriously impaired her plans.

If the MDT program is indeed a unique teaching situation, focusing on populations not adequately served by the public school system and one which should therefore utilize educational philosophies, techniques, and practices different from the regular public school system, it seems necessary for teachers coming into the program, as well as other staff members, to receive preservice training which will enable them to perform effectively in the unique MDT setting. Preservice training might even be more crucial for personnel with prior experience in public schools since they may have to make sharp changes in their approach as compared to those for whom teaching is a new experience.

Inservice Training. The majority of center administrators and supervisors indicated that inservice training was built into the program. However, further questioning revealed that, generally, there were no formal, regularly scheduled inservice training programs for center staffs. In most instances, inservice "training" consisted of informal meetings between supervisors and their staffs, opportunities for staff to voluntarily attend courses offered by the State College at Oswego, or for a few selected staff members to attend the Area Manpower Institutes for Development of Staff (AMIDS) program provided by the Washington Technical Institute. One exception in New York City was reported by a center administrator who indicated that he himself provides six scheduled formal sessions per year for each group of professional staff members.

The most frequent kind of inservice training seems to be the discussion of professional problems at regularly scheduled staff meetings. However, this approach is clearly limited because it is not part of an organized inservice training program and also, because there is competition in such meetings with "nuts and bolts" operational matters.

MDT Staff Recommendations. In the course of the interviews and discussions, center administrators and supervisors in the skills, basic education, and counseling areas were specifically asked: "What recommendations would you make for improving MDT staff training?" Four of the 5 center administrators interviewed in New York City expressed a need for an on-going structured, inservice training program. One supervisor preferred a return to on-site supervisors reporting to the Teacher-in-Charge. This particular recommendation agrees with our own observation that the areas of responsibility for the center administrators and the city-wide supervisors need to be clarified. Our own recommendation is, as indicated earlier, that more authority be given to center administrators and that they be responsible for directing the supervisors who would be located physically at the center. City-wide supervisors could then play a complementary role rather than a conflicting role as at present by concentrating their energies on consultation, planning, and in particular, the structuring and administration of formalized preservice and inservice training programs. We make this recommendation in the context of sound organizational management: Internal responsibility and authority should rest with the top level administrator on site while matters of city wide professional concern should be planned, coordinated, and structured outside the individual sites with the consultation and involvement of the center administrators.

Several center administrators outside New York City made specific reference to AMIDS training which they perceived as being extremely valuable. Characteristically, the recommendations for AMIDS were to extend it for more than two weeks, to institute an AMIDS program in each federal region, to provide on-site training at the centers, to give college credit for courses on the teaching of the disadvantaged, and to provide an opportunity for the entire staff to participate in AMIDS training.

Still another approach by several center administrators was to provide inservice training at the centers themselves, for which they asked time and money. In our opinion it would probably be more appropriate to provide preservice and inservice training from a source outside the center rather than providing each center with the resources for developing its own program. The general preservice and inservice training program should stress knowledge, ideas, attitudes, methods, etc. common to all MDT situations, while learnings unique to specific centers could be provided on site.

When skills teacher supervisors were asked what recommendations they would make for improving MDT skills teacher training, three of the four in New York City stressed the need for a paid schedule of inservice training. The majority of skills teacher supervisors outside of New York City also indicated a need for some form of teacher training.

The counselor supervisors in the MDT multi-centers felt that MDT counselor training and effectiveness could be improved if formalized focused training were provided: specifically, courses in dealing with the disadvantaged, including courses in counseling. One supervisor said that it would be mutually valuable for counselor education programs to arrange for interns to serve at the centers.

Summary and Recommendations. Generally speaking, center administrators, skills teacher supervisors, and counselor supervisors stressed the need for both preservice and inservice training. They indicated that it was not possible to offer such services because of lack of funds. They also noted that there had been some provision for these activities before funds were cut back and they felt keenly that the program has suffered as a result. Their current efforts to supply preservice and inservice training in spite of a lack of funds underlines their attitudes concerning the importance of such programs.

We recommend that both preservice and inservice training programs be planned and implemented as a state-wide MDT multi-center policy. We must stress here that preservice training be differentiated from orientation. The proper role of orientation is to induct new staff members into a particular center and to clarify its relationship to other administrative units. Preservice training, on the other hand, should be used to re-educate public school teachers to a unique teaching situation and to prepare new teachers, without public school experience, with those professional skills necessary for successful performance in an MDT learning situation. At the very least, we recommend that a preservice training program be introduced on an experimental basis to study its impact on aspects of the program such as drop-out rates of trainees and retention rates of professional staff.

We recommend strongly that inservice training be introduced in the multi-centers on a formalized basis. While the informal inservice training sessions as they now exist are important in the sense that something may be better than nothing, they are far from adequate in helping professional staff keep up with innovations that are of particular value to the MDT setting. We recommend that the informal sessions continue as a supplement to a more formalized inservice training program but that the informal sessions stress more individual supervision rather than inservice training.

There was a general feeling amongst all those questioned that the AMIDS training was very valuable and highly desirable but apparently there was not sufficient opportunity for large numbers of the staff to attend such training. While the AMIDS training may indeed be as valuable and competent as is generally felt, the positive attitude toward this program should be further interpreted within the context of there being little else in the way of inservice training. Our own examination of the materials included in the AMIDS training course suggests that a great deal of time and effort has gone into the development of this program and that it is probably the best inservice training experience that is currently available for MDT staff. Therefore, in considering the role of preservice and inservice training for MDT centers, it is important that the role of AMIDS be seriously considered as a major resource.

The opportunity to attend specialized MDT courses at institutions like Oswego should be continued and expanded. There are few institutions of higher education providing specialized inservice and preservice MDT courses. Yet there are institutions of higher learning within reach of every multi-center. We recommend that the State Department of Education explore with these colleges and universities the possibility of offering courses for MDT staff members, tuition free. Finally, it seems to us also that an untapped reservoir of talent which could be used in the development of formal preservice and inservice programs is available among the staff members of the MDT centers, and we therefore recommend that selected MDT staff who have demonstrated outstanding capabilities be involved in such formal training programs.

Facilities and Equipment

The observation and appraisal of plant facilities and equipment were made by experienced vocational educators using standardized guides prepared by the Study staff for this purpose. Also, important contributions to this aspect of the study were made by Mrs. Anna Wiman, Director of Sweden's Manpower Training Program, during her visit and consultation. What follows is primarily, however, our pooling of all these observations with special indications of Mrs. Wiman's findings where appropriate.

General. New York City centers were generally in "inner city" areas, while most of those outside New York City were on the fringes of the inner city. In most cases, they seemed quite accessible to the populations they were designed to serve.

Most of the buildings throughout the State were converted old buildings rather than buildings designed and constructed for MDT training.

Mrs. Wiman's observations are most relevant here: she found that our facilities frequently resembled those of Sweden's program in the early days, that is, old factories, old schools, etc. While they still have some facilities of this kind, for the most part they have been phased out in favor of good or new buildings for the specific purpose of manpower training. The Swedish approach is that an unemployed person, a disadvantaged person, has his disadvantage reinforced by dirty, old, disadvantaged surroundings. They feel strongly that "nice and clean environments help a person to change his attitudes and help him to become better motivated for training and for new occupations."

Furthermore, and here we quote again from Mrs. Wiman's comments: "We found that people thought that training going on in those rundown buildings must be a kind of second rate training; and thus, public opinion of the training was negatively influenced by such plants." Although the term "rundown" is not an accurate description of the multi-center facilities in New York State, the general point is worth bearing in mind as we consider the general picture of these facilities. It is important to note that our field observers agreed that the basic construction and maintenance of all buildings, including the very old ones, ranged from adequate to excellent.

Internally, the conditions of halls and passageways were found to be in good condition. Most centers used fluorescent lighting which was normally satisfactory. Generally, electrical systems seemed to be kept in safe condition. However, in one center where the electrical wiring was fairly adequate, an outlet in one room had been provided by running a long extension cord from another room.

Heating and ventilation systems were generally poor to satisfactory. One center in New York City provided heat from a coal-fired boiler through one large duct situated on the outer border of a loft, used for the total MDT program. Rooms farthest from the duct receive little heat and are very cold when outside temperature is low. The heat forced from the duct generates a low level of noise which might interfere with class instruction. A center outside of New York City was equipped for steam and radiation heat but made no provision for fresh air circulation. Two other centers were very cold and drafty on the days of the site visits.

Toilet and washroom facilities were easily accessible in all but one of the New York City centers. In one center, a former girls' high school, there were no urinals, and the men teacher's facility was extremely dark. The walls in a male trainee's toilet were powdery, flaking, and in generally poor condition. Soap and toweling were provided in all centers, but there was no hot water in two centers. In centers outside New York City, six of the seven buildings had adequate toilet facilities. In one instance, toilet facilities were available on only two floors. In another building, facilities were ample except for the food service area. There, students had to go out of the area to the lavatory to wash their hands.

While a few centers provided hot food and cafeteria space for trainee meals in connection with food service training programs, in most instances, centers merely provided eating spaces where trainees might eat lunches which they brought with them, e.g., in a basement or former gym.

General safety conditions were found to be quite good with two exceptions. In one New York City center there seemed to be no master switches, safety switches or magnetic disconnects. Consequently, unsupervised machines could easily be started. In one center outside New York City, fire drill exits, signs, or extinguishers were not visible.

Classrooms. Twelve classrooms of blue collar skills teachers in centers outside of New York City and three in New York City were visited. Consequently, our conclusions cannot be generalized for New York City. The New York City blue collar skills classrooms were adequate for their current enrollment but space would be limited if enrollment exceeded the maximum of fifteen trainees. In centers outside New York City, most blue collar skills classrooms were satisfactory to excellent in area, shape and layout. Room furnishings were clean and appropriate to their function in all centers. Statewide, instructional equipment was easily accessible, in ample supply, and well maintained. However, in several instances controls over tools and supply inventories seemed dubious.

The classrooms of seventeen teachers of white collar skills were observed: six in New York City and eleven outside of New York City. The New York City classrooms were found to be appropriate in area, shape and layout for their purposes. Outside of New York City the classrooms were judged adequate in area, shape and layout with some exceptions: one room had several supporting columns obscuring vision, a second appeared small and overcrowded, and the ratio of length to width precluded flexibility of furniture arrangements. All classrooms seemed appropriately and adequately furnished for their particular types of instruction. There was no evidence of trainee misuse of furnishings. Instructional equipment was suitable and available in all but two instances: one New York City classroom had only two electric typewriters out of twenty; one classroom outside of New York City had manual machines only.

An additional comment on equipment is necessary here: in one New York City center considerable quantities of office and electronic equipment had been stolen through break-and-entry. However, there is no insurance and no funds are available for security guards.

MDT Staff General Recommendations

All MDT staff were asked to make general recommendations for improving the centers. Following is a summary of the kinds of recommendations made:

Center Administrators—New York City. There is a need for more autonomy at the center level; trainees should spend a longer period of time in the program and center administrators should have the authority to extend length of stay for those trainees who need it; better financial arrangements should be made for men with families to obviate their need to drop out to support their dependents; better provision should be made for reaching the unmotivated population; paid non-teaching time is needed for staff meetings; more time is needed to meet with staff even if the center has to shut down.

Center Administrators—Other New York State. More freedom should be built into the MDT structure to allow center administrators flexibility in program operation; there is a need for continuous funding to maintain a stable continuous program; the number of occupational areas provided for training should be increased; centers should return to a six hour day; additional funds are needed for services such as followup studies, provision for medical examinations, maintenance men, and replacement of equipment; provision for staff fringe benefits such as sick leave; and provision for staff to visit other MDT facilities; more industry involvement in the program.

Skill Teacher Supervisors—New York City. Provide clinical experience for Licensed Practical Nurse trainees in the morning rather than in the evening since there is more activity during morning hours; inservice courses for upgrading teachers; additional facilities as an adjunct to the center, such as day-care facilities.

Skill Teacher Supervisors—Other New York State. More cafeteria space and water coolers; air-conditioned classrooms; more custodians; provide good physical check-up for trainees prior to entrance into program; accelerate funding since courses are underway before materials and equipment are available; eliminate long pause between cycles; closer relationship with community groups; periodic open house; more publicity; more help; reduction of 8-hour day.

Basic Education Supervisors—New York City. The students often are not placed in jobs for which they are trained; need to be more realistic with trainees all along.

Basic Education Supervisors—Other New York State. Institute annual funding; provide paid preparation time for teachers; a shorter day for staff and trainees; provide more center participation in recruitment of trainees; more followup.

Counselor Supervisors—Statewide. More on-site services such as child-care; improved coordination through staff meetings; more autonomy at the center level; more involvement in policy making at the center level; hot lunch program.

Blue Collar Skills Teachers—New York City. Provide more job security; arrange for trainees to get stipends on time; give permission for teachers to go out and recruit trainees; provide more staff; increase clerical assistance; place financial department on premises; improve the physical facility with maintenance activities such as painting.

White Collar Skills Teachers—New York City. Provide more preparation time for teachers; reduce amount of paper work; adequate delegation of responsibilities so that teachers are free to spend more time teaching.

Blue Collar Skills Teachers—Other New York State. Provide annual funding; improve screening techniques for trainees so as to eliminate people who don't belong in particular areas; reduce daily hour requirements from 8 hours.

White Collar Skills Teachers—Other New York State. Provide staff benefits such as sick leave; better followup procedures; more publicity on programs to reach more trainees; provide time for lesson preparations; encourage teachers to engage in job placement by working with the Employment Service and employers; air condition the classrooms; provide water coolers; provide more cafeteria space.

Basic Education Teachers—New York City. More teachers should be black or Puerto Rican; should have black and Puerto Rican study of culture and history in basic education curriculum; separate trade groups in basic education classes.

Basic Education Teachers—Other New York State. Provide better screening and selection of trainees; Employment Service shouldn't make the decision on screening and training offered; provide air conditioning; provide water coolers; install pay phone; provide more cafeteria space; improve communication between staff and administration; provide more information on supporting health services; more stability in funding; provide more autonomy in running program.

Counselors—New York City. Less bureaucracy; eliminate time clocks; provide preparation time with pay; less paper work; put doors on counselor rooms; provide contracts to professional staff for security reasons.

Counselors—Other New York State. Provide counseling facilities that are private; offer tenure for MDT teachers.

CHAPTER VI

THE SERVICE COMPONENTS: OCCUPATIONAL TRAINING, BASIC EDUCATION, AND COUNSELING

We are concerned in this chapter with three major areas of the manpower training process as seen in the multi-centers. These are occupational skills training, basic education, and counseling. MDT legislation and administration now reflect the widely accepted notion that skills training by itself is not enough to assure skills mastery. More often than not deficiencies in reading, writing, and arithmetic have been obstacles to skills learning; and a range of personal, social, vocational, and family problems have also impaired the training process. Hence, basic education and counseling, among other services, have been introduced to deal with such needs in the training setting itself.

Occupational Training

A study as broad in scope as this one nevertheless did not allow for a direct and intensive assessment of the teaching process itself. Such an assessment needs yet to be done. What follows in this section then, are analyses of responses by multi-center personnel to questions concerning certain aspects of skills training: selection and assignment of trainees; curriculum and related matters; enrollment; teaching load and methods; absentee and dropout information; assessment of trainee learning, success and motivation; and, finally, MDT staff recommendations for skills training and pre-vocational training.

Selection and Assignment of Trainees. Both center administrators and skills teacher supervisors generally reported that they played little or no part in the selection of trainees and their assignment to skills training areas. These matters were reported as an Employment Service responsibility (Table 6.1). While all centers reported provisions for transferring trainees from one skills training area to another, one gets the impression that such transfers are not made in all instances when they should be made because of the need for approval from the Employment Service. In those instances when transfers are recommended, they are as a result of conferences including several staff members who have worked with the trainees.

TABLE 6.1

Center's Role in Selection and Assignment of Trainees As Seen By Center Administrators and Skills Teacher Supervisors

	NYC		ONYS		Total NYS	
	Center Administrators	Skills Teacher Supervisors	Center Administrators	Skills Teacher Supervisors	Center Administrators	Skills Teacher Supervisors
Accept Employment Service Decision	4	1	4	6	8	7
Check Employment Service Assignment	–	–	3	1	3	1
Have Own Methods	–	1	1	4	1	5
No response	1	2	–	–	1	2
Total	5	4	8	11	13	15

Since those who have been working with the trainees obviously should be in the best position to evaluate their suitability for the training they have been receiving, it seems professionally inappropriate for the Employment Service to make the final decision concerning transfer from one skills area to another. We say this with full knowledge of the administrative responsibilities of the Employment Service. However, when it is discovered that a trainee is unsuited for the training for which he has been referred, and the trainee and those who have worked with him all agree that another area would be more appropriate, and another training slot is available, no other criteria should be interposed. We recommend exploring the feasibility of decentralizing to the center level the authority to transfer trainees from one training program to another.

Curriculum and Related Matters. The centralization of MDT in New York City was apparent again when we asked center administrators and skills teacher supervisors who made decisions concerning training objectives, course content, teaching materials, and equipment. While key center personnel are consulted, evidently decisions are generally made in these areas at the central office level. It appears from interview responses that course content is usually developed initially under the supervision of the citywide supervisor for a skills training area with the consultation of industry and labor. Once the course content is determined, all five New York City multi-centers are required to follow the course outline. While there is an indication that individual skills teachers modify these outlines in practice, there seems to be an official citywide document and policy.

On the other hand, center administrators and skills teacher supervisors in multi-centers outside New York City, generally reported that matters such as training content, curriculum development, and the development of curriculum materials are handled at the center level by staff and advisory committees. Financial decisions are reported as usually made at the Board of Education level.

The sample of skills teachers in the New York City multi-centers also usually gave responses indicating that decisions concerning course content were made outside the center (Table 6.2). However, 17 of the 23 skills teachers in the Other New York State sample who felt they knew, reported that course content was determined within the center and often by themselves.

TABLE 6.2

Source of Decisions For Course Content As Reported By Skills Teachers

Source	NYC Blue Collar	NYC White Collar	NYC Total	ONYS Blue Collar	ONYS White Collar	ONYS Total	Total NYS Blue Collar	Total NYS White Collar	Total NYS Total
Teacher	–	1	1	9	3	12	9	4	13
Supervisor and Teacher	–	–	–	1	4	5	1	4	5
Teacher-in-Charge	–	1	1	–	–	–	–	1	1
Advisory Committee	–	–	–	1	–	1	1	–	1
State	9	7	16	4	1	5	13	8	21
Don't Know	–	4	4	2	4	6	2	8	10
Total	9	13	22	17	12	29	26	25	51

It seems that the essential difference between multi-centers in New York City and the rest of the State in curriculum matters as well as in other areas, may be one of level rather than approach. For example, all multi-centers usually include staff committees and advisory committees in curriculum development. However, the locus of direction for New York City is outside the center and at a citywide level while in the rest of the State it is within the individual center. It would seem that we have here an excellent natural opportunity to study the effects of relative centralization. New York City is the only city in the State with several multi-centers. If other cities ever open additional centers, it would be helpful to have prior information concerning the effects of centralization.

Enrollment. Table 6.3 indicates that the number of trainees enrolled in each of the centers at the time of our visits, was substantially higher in centers outside of

TABLE 6.3

Number of Trainees Currently Enrolled As Reported By Center Administrators

Number of Trainees	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
0 – 50	1	–	1
51 – 100	2	–	2
101 – 150	1	1	2
151 – 200	–	3	3
201 – 250	1	3	4
251 – 300	–	1	1
Total	5	8	13

New York City. This could not be attributed to training capacity as is indicated by Table 6.4. We postponed our visitations to the centers for several months because repeated inquiries generally indicated that centers throughout the State were operating well below capacity as a result of a delay in authorization for recycling. We are unable to answer the question as to why New York City centers enrolled such a substantially smaller number of trainees during the data collection period.

Center administrators generally perceive the overwhelming majority of their trainees as falling in the disadvantaged category (Table 6.5). While we did not have data readily available to compare center administrators' judgments with actual proportions, we did get the impression that center administrators may have made judgments based on their own subjective criteria rather than on objective data. It would be well worth looking into the extent to which center administrators' estimates of the characteristics of the populations they serve correspond with more objective data since effective program administration obviously would bear a relationship to accurate understanding of the population being served.

TABLE 6.4

Number of Trainees At Maximum Capacity As Reported By Center Administrators

Number of Trainees	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
100 – 200	–	1	1
201 – 300	2	–	2
301 – 400	–	4	4
401 – 500	–	1	1
501 – 600	2	1	3
601 – 700	–	–	–
701 – 800	1	–	1
801 – 900	–	1	1
Total	5	8	13

TABLE 6.5

Usual Proportion of Disadvantaged Trainees As Reported By Center Administrators

Proportion of Disadvantaged	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
71 – 80%	1	1	2
81 – 90%	2	2	4
91 – 100%	2	3	5
Total	5	6	11

NOTE: There were no responses from 2 Center Administrators, Other New York State.

Teaching Load. Teachers in centers outside of New York City reported that the typical pattern is to meet with one group of trainees five times a week (Tables 6.6, 6.7); in a few instances they reported that they meet with some groups from one to three times a week. In New York City, however, the pattern seems to be for teachers to meet with more than one group of students per week and to hold five sessions per week; in a few instances they met with some groups over five times a week.

TABLE 6.6

Number of Groups of Trainees Per Week
Taught By Skills Teachers

	NYC			ONYS			Total NYS		
Number of Groups	Blue Collar	White Collar	Total	Blue Collar	White Collar	Total	Blue Collar	White Collar	Total
1	4	3	7	13	7	20	17	10	27
2	4	5	9	3	3	6	7	8	15
3	—	2	2	—	—	—	—	2	2
4	1	3	4	—	—	—	1	3	4
5	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	1	1
Total	9	13	22	16	11	27	25	24	49

NOTE: There were no responses from one ONYS White Collar Skills Teacher and one ONYS Blue Collar Skills Teacher.

TABLE 6.7

Number of Sessions Per Week with Each Group Taught By Skills Teachers

	NYC			ONYS			Total NYS		
Number of Sessions	Blue Collar	White Collar	Total	Blue Collar	White Collar	Total	Blue Collar	White Collar	Total
1	–	–	–	2	–	2	2	–	2
2	–	–	–	2	1	3	2	1	3
3	–	–	–	1	–	1	1	–	1
4	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
5	11	16	27	13	14	27	24	30	54
over 5	2	3	5	–	–	–	2	3	5
Total	13	19	32	18	15	33	31	34	65

NOTE: Totals are greater than sample sizes due to multiple responses.

New York City classes seem to be shorter than classes in centers in the rest of New York State (Table 6.8). In New York City, half of the responding teachers reported class sessions of one hour or less, while only 4 of 20 responding teachers in centers outside of New York City reported classes of such short duration.

Centers outside of New York City seem to concentrate their blue collar instruction in sessions of six hours or more per day while blue collar instruction in New York City is more evenly spread between four hours and over six hours per day. White collar sessions in centers outside of New York City were reported as spreading between three hours and over six hours per day while in New York City centers the typical white collar class was reported as one hour or less in duration.

Class sizes were comparable in New York City centers and centers outside of New York City. Teachers reported that their smallest classes usually ranged between 6 and 15 trainees (Table 6.9), while their largest classes were more often

TABLE 6.8

Length of Class Sessions Taught By Skills Teachers

Length of Session	NYC Blue Collar	NYC White Collar	NYC Total	ONYS Blue Collar	ONYS White Collar	ONYS Total	Total NYS Blue Collar	Total NYS White Collar	Total NYS Total
Under 1 hour	1	5	6	–	1	1	1	6	7
1 hour	–	4	4	1	2	3	1	6	7
2 hours	1	–	1	–	–	–	1	–	1
3 hours	–	–	–	1	2	3	1	2	3
4 hours	2	2	4	–	1	1	2	3	5
5 hours	2	–	2	–	1	1	2	1	3
6 hours	2	–	2	1	1	2	3	1	4
Over 6 hours	1	–	1	7	2	9	8	2	10
Total	9	11	20	10	10	20	19	21	40

NOTE: There were no responses from 2 White Collar Skills Teachers in NYC, 7 Blue Collar Skills Teachers and 2 White Collar Skills Teachers in ONYS.

TABLE 6.9

Typical Minimum Class Size As Reported By Skills Teachers

Number of Trainees	NYC Blue Collar	NYC White Collar	NYC Total	ONYS Blue Collar	ONYS White Collar	ONYS Total	Total NYS Blue Collar	Total NYS White Collar	Total NYS Total
1 – 5	–	–	–	–	1	1	–	1	1
6 – 10	5	7	12	6	2	8	11	9	20
11 – 15	4	4	8	4	3	7	8	7	15
16 – 20	–	1	1	–	5	5	–	6	6
21 – 25	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
26 – 30	–	–	–	–	1	1	–	1	1
Over 30	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Total	9	12	21	10	12	22	19	24	43

NOTE: There were no responses from one NYC White Collar Skills Teacher, and 7 ONYS Blue Collar Skills Teachers.

between 11 and 20 (Table 6.10). When allowances are made for absentees, it would seem that most daily classes typically have an enrollment between 6 and 20 trainees (Table 6.11).

It should be quite clear that these are teacher judgments made without reference to objective data. Their importance then is limited to the inferences that can be made from discrepancies between teachers' judgments and actual frequencies which were not readily available.

TABLE 6.10

Typical Maximum Class Size As Reported By Skills Teachers

	NYC			ONYS			Total NYS		
Number of Trainees	Blue Collar	White Collar	Total	Blue Collar	White Collar	Total	Blue Collar	White Collar	Total
1 – 5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
6 – 10	—	—	—	2	—	2	2	—	2
11 – 15	2	4	6	3	1	4	5	5	10
16 – 20	3	5	8	5	6	11	8	11	19
21 – 25	2	3	5	—	—	—	2	3	5
26 – 30	1	–	1	—	2	2	1	2	3
Over 30	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	1	1
Total	8	12	20	10	10	20	18	22	40

NOTE: There were no responses from 1 NYC Blue Collar and 1 NYC White Collar Skills Teachers; and 7 ONYS Blue Collar and 2 ONYS White Collar Skills Teachers.

TABLE 6.11

Average Group Attendance As Reported By Skills Teachers

Average Attendance	NYC Blue Collar	NYC White Collar	NYC Total	ONYS Blue Collar	ONYS White Collar	ONYS Total	Total NYS Blue Collar	Total NYS White Collar	Total NYS Total
1 – 5	1	–	1	1	–	1	2	–	2
6 – 10	–	4	4	5	1	6	5	5	10
11 – 15	4	5	9	7	3	10	11	8	19
16 – 20	1	3	4	1	6	7	2	9	11
21 – 25	1	1	2	–	1	1	1	2	3
26 – 30	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Over 30	1	–	1	–	1	1	1	1	2
Total	8	13	21	14	12	26	22	25	47

NOTE: There were no responses from one Blue Collar Skills Teacher, NYC and 3 Blue Collar Skills Teachers, ONYS.

Teaching Methods. When skills teachers were asked the methods of training that they use, the order of frequency of the four leading methods was demonstrations, practice sessions, lectures and group discussions[1] (Table 6.12). It is interesting to note that the skills teachers reported demonstration and practice sessions as being the most effective techniques (Table 6.13), while they reported the lecture mode as being the least effective (Table 6.14). Considering this, one wonders at the continued high use of lectures (Table 6.12).

---

[1] Films were considered to be teaching aids rather than teaching methods.

TABLE 6.12

Teaching Methods Used As Reported By Skills Teachers

Methods	NYC			ONYS			Total NYS		
	Blue Collar	White Collar	Total	Blue Collar	White Collar	Total	Blue Collar	White Collar	Total
Demonstration	9	12	21	14	12	26	23	24	47
Practice Sessions	7	11	18	13	9	22	20	20	40
Lecture	6	8	14	10	9	19	16	17	33
Film, T.V.	8	4	12	10	5	15	18	9	27
Group Discussion	5	7	12	6	7	13	11	14	25
Field Visits	2	4	6	3	3	6	5	7	12
Role Playing	1	3	4	1	2	3	2	5	7
Special Guests	1	2	3	2	1	3	3	3	6
Programmed Instruction	3	1	4	–	–	–	3	1	4
Panels, Forums	–	1	1	–	–	–	–	1	1
Other	1	4	5	8	6	14	9	10	19
Total	43	57	100	67	54	121	110	111	221

NOTE: Totals are greater than sample sizes due to multiple responses.

TABLE 6.13

Most Effective Teaching Methods As Reported By Skills Teachers

Most Effective Methods	NYC Blue Collar	 White Collar	 Total	ONYS Blue Collar	 White Collar	 Total	Total NYS Blue Collar	 White Collar	 Total
Demonstration	8	6	14	7	8	15	15	14	29
Practice Sessions	6	5	11	7	3	10	13	8	21
Films, T.V.	1	2	3	–	2	2	1	4	5
Group Discussion	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	4
Field Visits	1	2	3	1	–	1	2	2	4
Lecture	1	–	1	1	1	2	2	1	3
Programmed Instruction	2	–	2	–	–	–	2	–	2
Role Playing	–	1	1	–	–	–	–	1	1
Special Guests	–	–	–	1	–	1	1	–	1
Panels, Forums	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Other	1	3	4	2	2	4	3	5	8
Total	21	20	41	20	17	37	41	37	78

NOTE: Totals are greater than sample size due to multiple responses.

TABLE 6.14

Least Effective Teaching Methods As Reported By Skills Teachers

Least Effective Methods	NYC			ONYS			Total NYS		
	Blue Collar	White Collar	Total	Blue Collar	White Collar	Total	Blue Collar	White Collar	Total
Lecture	5	6	11	4	4	8	9	10	19
Group Discussion	1	3	4	1	1	2	2	4	6
Demonstration	–	2	2	1	–	1	1	2	3
Films, T.V.	1	–	1	2	–	2	3	–	3
Role Playing	1	–	1	–	1	1	1	1	2
Panels, Forums	1	1	2	–	–	–	1	1	2
Special Guests	1	–	1	–	–	–	1	–	1
Programmed Instruction	1	–	1	–	–	–	1	–	1
Practice Sessions	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Field Visits	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Other	–	1	1	1	2	3	1	3	4
Total	11	13	24	9	8	17	20	21	41

NOTE: Totals are greater than sample sizes due to multiple responses.

There were no major differences in terms of the blue collar vs. white collar or New York City vs. Other New York State categories. The ranking of demonstrations first and lectures third as frequently used teaching methods suggests that emphasis in the teaching process may tend to be teacher rather than student-centered. We recommend that a study of the teaching process itself be conducted to help determine the extent to which traditional teaching approaches are being used in the multi-centers.

Absentee and Dropout Information. To a question concerned with the approach used in class to cut down on absenteeism, 37 responses were received from skills teachers (Table 6.15). The methods expressed by the teachers were classified as positive or negative. Positive methods were defined as those reflecting an attempt to understand the trainee's motivation and develop imaginative efforts to stimulate his interest. Negative approaches were those which tended to impose punishments such as threat of loss of pay and lectures on rules and regulations. It is interesting to note that while the majority of teachers stress positive approaches, such approaches were more frequently reported by teachers of blue collar occupations than white collar occupations. This suggests that it would be worthwhile to investigate the impact of differential styles of teaching between blue collar and white collar teachers. Basic education teachers and counselors were less able to report concrete methods which could reduce absenteeism.

Of the 46 skills teachers who provided dropout estimates, 23 reported a rate under 10 percent, 13 reported between 10 and 20 percent, 6 reported between 21 and 30 percent, and only 2 reported a dropout rate over 30 percent (Table 6.16). This is far less than usual MDT dropout figures reported and considerably lower than the 36 percent—43 percent reported for New York State in an earlier section. Either

TABLE 6.15

Methods Reported By Skills Teachers To Prevent Absenteeism

	NYC			ONYS			Total NYS		
Methods	Blue Collar	White Collar	Total	Blue Collar	White Collar	Total	Blue Collar	White Collar	Total
Positive	6	4	10	13	6	19	19	10	29
Negative	-	2	2	2	4	6	2	6	8
No answer or unscorable	3	7	10	2	2	4	5	9	14
Total	9	13	22	17	12	29	26	25	51

TABLE 6.16

Dropout Rates Reported By Skills Teachers

	NYC			ONYS			Total NYS		
Dropout Rate	Blue Collar	White Collar	Total	Blue Collar	White Collar	Total	Blue Collar	White Collar	Total
None	2	1	2	–	–	–	1	1	2
Under 10%	2	7	9	9	5	14	11	12	23
10 – 20%	4	–	4	6	3	9	10	3	13
21 – 30%	1	3	4	–	2	2	1	5	6
31 – 40%	–	–	–	–	1	1	–	1	1
41 – 50%	–	–	–	–	1	1	–	1	1
Total	8	11	19	15	12	27	23	23	46

NOTE: There were no responses from one Blue Collar and two White Collar Skills Teachers in NYC and two Blue Collar Skills Teachers, ONYS.

the skills teachers are not aware of the real magnitude of the dropout rates in their classes or they may have attempted to present positive images to the interviewers.

Generally speaking, most center staff are in agreement that the reasons trainees give for dropping out when they do are most often health problems, child care problems and other family problems (Table 6.17). (These options were most frequently selected from amongst those provided in the interview.)

Assessment of Trainee Learning. When asked to judge how well their trainees were learning, the overwhelming majority of the skills teachers indicated that their trainees were doing well, a small group believed that the trainees were doing adequately, and only 2 teachers in the sample reported that the students were doing poorly (Table 6.18). There were no major differences between blue collar vs. white collar and New York City vs. Other New York State groups.

Skills teachers were asked what techniques they used for judging how well trainees learned. The two most typical responses were "evaluation of classroom performance" and their own "teacher-made achievement tests" (Table 6.19). There was more of a tendency for blue collar skills teachers than white collar skills teachers to rely on classroom performance of trainees than any other method. White collar skills teachers reported the use of their own teacher-made achievement tests most frequently. Again, there were no discernible differences geographically.

Only four teachers in our sample used standardized achievement tests to measure progress of their trainees. While the limitations of standardized achievement tests for use with disadvantaged populations has been well publicized, all achievement tests are not completely useless for these populations, particularly if local norms are developed. We recommend that a pilot study be done to

TABLE 6.17

Reasons for Trainee Dropout

Reasons for Dropping Out	Center Administrators			Skills Supervisors			Basic Ed. Supervisors			Counselor Supervisors		
	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
Length of Training Program	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Lack of Confidence	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	1
Academic Difficulty	–	–	–	1	–	1	–	–	–	–	1	1
Dissatisfaction with Placement	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	1	–	1	1
Dissatisfaction with Total Program	–	1	1	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–
Health Problems	3	6	9	3	4	7	–	1	1	1	1	2
Child Care Problems	2	3	5	2	4	6	–	1	1	–	3	3
Other Family Problems	2	3	5	2	4	6	–	2	2	1	1	2
Late Arrival of Payments	–	2	2	1	–	1	–	1	1	–	1	1
Poor Transportation Arrangements	–	2	2	–	2	2	–	1	1	–	2	2
Trainees Obtain Employment	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	–	1	1
Other	6	11	17	3	12	15	–	3	3	1	4	5

Note: Most of the responses in the "Other" category are representative of the categories in the table. The only exception is "financial difficulties" which was frequently mentioned in the "Other" category.

The larger than sample total is due to multiple responses.

As Reported By Staff Members

Skills Teacher			Basic Ed. Teacher			Counselor			Totals		
NYC	ONYS	Total NYS	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
1	–	1	1	1	2	–	–	–	2	1	3
–	2	2	–	3	3	–	–	–	–	6	6
3	3	6	–	–	–	1	2	3	5	6	11
1	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	3	3	6	9
–	–	–	1	1	2	–	–	–	1	2	3
4	7	11	1	3	4	4	4	8	16	26	42
9	5	14	1	1	2	2	4	6	16	21	37
10	8	18	1	1	2	2	2	4	18	21	39
3	4	7	–	2	2	–	1	1	4	11	15
–	3	3	–	1	1	1	1	2	1	12	13
5	1	6	–	2	2	2	4	6	7	8	15
12	19	31	2	5	7	5	3	8	29	57	86

TABLE 6.18

Skills Teachers Report of Extent of Trainee Learning

	NYC			ONYS			Total NYS		
	Blue Collar	White Collar	Total	Blue Collar	White Collar	Total	Blue Collar	White Collar	Total
Well	8	10	18	13	7	20	21	17	38
Adequately	1	1	2	4	4	8	5	5	10
Poorly	–	1	1	–	1	1	–	2	2
Total	9	12	21	17	12	29	26	24	50

NOTE: There was no response from one White Collar Skills Teacher in NYC.

TABLE 6.19

Methods Reported By Teachers For Assessing Trainee Learning

	NYC			ONYS			Total NYS		
	Blue Collar	White Collar	Total	Blue Collar	White Collar	Total	Blue Collar	White Collar	Total
Standard Achievement Tests	–	3	3	–	1	1	–	4	4
Own Teacher-Made Achievement Tests	4	11	15	5	9	14	9	20	29
Evaluation of Class Performance by Trainee	7	8	15	11	6	17	18	14	32
Evaluation of Written Assignment	2	2	4	1	1	2	3	3	6
Other	4	7	11	8	7	15	12	14	26
Total	17	31	48	25	24	49	42	55	97

NOTE: Totals are greater than sample sizes due to multiple responses.

determine if selected standardized achievement tests might not play a more meaningful role in assessing trainee progress, especially in the white collar skills areas.

Trainee Success and Motivation. With very few exceptions, center personnel indicated that they felt some trainees were more likely to succeed in the MDT program than others (Table 6.20). While this global response pattern might easily be predicted, a content analysis of the interview responses suggested that the great majority of center personnel felt that the trainees who were most likely to succeed

TABLE 6.20

"Does It Seem Some Trainees In the General MDT Program Are More Likely To Succeed Than Others?"

	NYC			ONYS			Total NYS		
	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total
Center Administrators	5	–	5	7	1	8	12	1	13
Skills Supervisors	2	1	3	9	–	9	11	1	12
Basic Ed. Supervisors	1	–	1	3	–	3	4	–	4
Counselor Supervisors	1	–	1	3	–	3	4	–	4
Skills Teachers	19	2	21	28	1	29	47	3	50
Basic Ed. Teachers	3	–	3	8	–	8	11	–	11
Counselors	5	–	5	7	–	7	12	–	12
Total	36	3	39	65	2	67	101	5	106

NOTE: No responses from 1 each of following:
NYC Skills Teacher Supervisor, ONYS Counselor Supervisor, NYC Skills Teacher, NYC Basic Education Teacher, ONYS Basic Education Teacher, 2 ONYS Skills Teacher Supervisors.

were more accepting of and reflecting of middle-class values, had the highest aptitudes and the highest levels of education. One wonders to what extent the middle class model for success in MDT as reflected in staff attitudes might be a barrier to the socially alienated poor for whom there is considerable hope that MDT programs might help. It was our impression from talking with trainees informally that the current MDT populations tend to be accepting of the middle class notion that work assists access to the broader society. The pertinent question is, do they accept improving their circumstances through job training within an MDT framework before they enter the program or are they convinced of this after they enter the program? If they enter the program with these values, then it may be that MDT as currently structured is not necessarily reaching the hard core disadvantaged. Of course, the prevocational, individual and group counseling programs are addressed to this problem.

MDT Staff Recommendations: Skills Training. In the interviews, four skills teacher supervisors made recommendations for changes in skills training: Send trainees for basic education skills; provide a shorter day but longer program in terms of months; trade teachers should further their own education. Basic education supervisors (2) had no substantial recommendations to make for changes in the skills areas. There were three counselor supervisors with recommendations: more careful selection and training of staff; smaller trainee-teacher ratio; more faculty meetings.

Seven teachers of white collar occupations in centers outside New York City made the following recommendations: Increase the length of the training program (2); shorten the number of daily hours and increase the number of days; increase teaching staff; provide a one hour daily preparation period for teachers; increase cooperative or OJT training (2). There were six teachers of blue collar occupations in centers outside of New York City who made recommendations:

increase the training period (4); increase the length of the class period; shorten the teaching day from 8 hours to 6 hours.

Five teachers of blue collar occupations in New York City had more concrete recommendations to make: more depth in the skills training; trainees should have their own tools; more field visits to shops; more contact with private industry for students; improve the appearance of buildings with better lighting and paint. Only four teachers of white collar occupations in New York City had recommendations to make: provide day rather than evening hours for practical nurses' hospital experience; provide more instructional material; increase the length of the course; improve the screening of trainees before placing in skills areas.

MDT Staff Recommendations: Prevocational Training. Three of five New York City center administrators said that prevocational training needed changes: trainees should be exposed to a wider range of occupational areas; "firm-up" counselor's background to assure more realistic occupational choice; less prevocational time and more specific time. There were three recommendations from center administrators in centers outside of New York City: better articulation with specifics; more generic areas in prevocational program; no prevocational for adults since they usually have a good notion of what they want. It is interesting to note that these recommendations all differ from each other and may reflect local needs to some extent.

There were no recommendations for change from skills teacher supervisors in New York City. Four skills teacher supervisors in centers outside of New York City judged prevocational training a failure and recommended its elimination.

Only one basic education supervisor in the State had a specific recommendation for prevocational training and this was a criticism that trainees who are ready to move into specifics often are locked into prevocational training when they should be in specific skills training. Three counselor supervisors in the State had specific recommendations: the prevocational period should be made longer (2); there is a lack of occupational focus in the prevocational program.

Only one blue collar skills teacher in New York City commented on prevocational training. He thought that the training period was too long. Seven instructors of white collar occupations in New York City responded to the question and all seven felt that prevocational training should be eliminated in favor of more basic education, more time on specific skills, and more time in orientation.

Blue collar skills teachers in centers outside of New York City made recommendations in six instances: the training period is too long and should be made optional; prevocational training should be eliminated and included in the specific training; shop functions should not be included in prevocational training; students should be given remedial work to bring them up to a minimum skill level; prevocational trainees should not be separated into separate trade areas; more areas should be included in prevocation. Four teachers of white collar subjects in centers outside of New York City made recommendations: more students should be eliminated as a result of prevocation before they enter specifics; all students should take prevocation; prevocation should be made longer; there should be more weeks of prevocation but with a shorter day.

Three counselors in New York City made the following recommendations: occupational areas should be geared toward meeting the labor market needs in New York City and not New York State; more effective screening should be done before assignment to prevocation; prevocational training should be eliminated in certain areas, e.g., drafting, because trainees have already made occupational choices before entering prevocational training. Four counselors in centers outside New York City made recommendations: prevocational training should be eliminated (2);

eliminate the employment services pre-testing role; include more occupational information in the prevocational training.

Clearly the number and character of negative, doubtful or conflicting responses from staff members at all levels warrant both a close look at the efficacy of the prevocational training program and at the extent to which staff members are accurately informed about the prevocational training program. Inasmuch as the program was designed to deal with problems unique to MDT, it requires a thorough analysis. It should be noted that the 1967 State Education Department survey showed that prevocational training provoked a wide range of opinion.

Basic Education

As with occupational training, the basic education teaching process itself was not studied directly. We have reported here primarily those trends based on analysis of relevant staff interviews which we feel may contribute to understanding as well as those which merit more intensive study.

Assignment of Trainees. Four basic education supervisors gave a variety of responses to the question "How are trainees assigned to basic education?": All trainees take two hours of basic education and four hours of shop; continuous enrollment in basic education with the class size sometimes reaching 60 students in one room; assigned to basic education according to vocational area; grouped in basic education classes after given test by counselors.

The variety of assignment procedures reported by these basic education supervisors indicates that the centers may not have available to them information on the most suitable assignment and grouping methods. We suggest that this area may be one in which it is urgent to study current practices and to develop specific guidelines.

Curriculum Decisions. In contrast to the responses of skills instructors, basic education instructors reported more autonomy in determining the content of their courses. None of the 13 respondents indicated that course content was determined primarily outside of their own jurisdictions. In one instance a course outline was used as an aid for the instructor in determining his own course content and in several other instances the course content was determined by the instructor in consultation with the supervisor and shop teacher.

Relationship of Basic Education to Skills Training. When asked if basic education was directly related to skills training in their centers, the overwhelming majority of basic education supervisors, basic education instructors, and skills instructors replied in the affirmative (Table 6.21). Requests for specific examples of such relationships led to a large number of vague or general statements which suggested that the relationship might be rather tenuous in some instances and perhaps non-existent in others. Skills teachers in particular tended to be more critical of the lack of relationship than basic education teachers. It was our impression from this probing that a more detailed objective appraisal of the actual relationship between basic education and skills training would be warranted.

TABLE 6.21

Basic Education Supervisors, Basic Education and Skills Teachers
Judgments of Relatedness of Basic Education to Skills Training

	NYC			ONYS			Total NYS		
	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total
Basic Ed. Supervisors	1	—	1	3	—	3	4	—	4
Basic Ed. Teachers	4	—	4	8	1	9	12	1	13
Skills Teachers	17	1	18	24	3	27	41	4	45

NOTE: No responses from 4 NYC Skills Teachers, 2 ONYS Skills Teachers.

Enrollment. It would seem that the overwhelming majority of trainees are provided with basic education (Table 6.22). Only 3 center administrators reported that fewer than 90 percent of their trainees took basic education and of these, 2 reported between 80 percent and 90 percent and the other reported between 70 percent and 80 percent. The responses of the basic education supervisors also indicate that when trainees do not get basic education, it is an exception to the rule.

TABLE 6.22

Percent of Trainees Reported As Taking Basic Education

	NYC		ONYS		Total NYS	
Percent	Cen. Admin.	Basic Ed.Sup.	Cen. Admin.	Basic Ed.Sup.	Cen. Admin.	Basic Ed.Sup.
71 – 80	–	–	1	–	1	–
81 – 90	1	1	1	–	2	1
91 – 100	1	–	2	1	3	1
100	3	–	4	2	7	2
Total	5	1	8	3	13	4

Teaching Load. The typical statewide load seems to be for basic education teachers to meet with four or five different groups of 6 to 15 trainees each week once a day for class sessions that vary from under an hour to two hours in length (Tables 6.23 to 6.26). Somewhat more variability in load seems likely in the Other New York State group than in the New York City group. However, the sample sizes are so small that such a conclusion would be unwarranted without further investigation.

TABLE 6.23

Number of Groups Per Week Taught By Basic Education Teachers

Number of Groups	NYC B. E. Teachers	ONYS B. E. Teachers	Total NYS B. E. Teachers
1	1	–	1
2	–	1	1
3	1	1	2
4	–	4	4
5	2	–	2
6	–	1	1
7	–	1	1
Total	4	8	12

NOTE: One Basic Education Teacher, ONYS, reported working with individual trainees only.

TABLE 6.24

Minimum, Maximum, And Average Class Sizes As Reported By Basic Education Teachers

Number of Students	Minimum			Maximum			Average		
	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
1 – 5	1	5	6	–	–	–	–	2	2
6 – 10	–	4	4	–	2	2	–	4	4
11 – 15	2	–	2	–	3	3	2	1	3
16 – 20	–	–	–	2	2	4	1	–	1
21 – 25	–	–	–	1	1	2	–	–	–
Total	3	9	12	3	8	11	3	7	10

NOTE: There was no minimum, maximum, or average response from one NYC Basic Education Teacher, no maximum response from one ONYS Basic Education Teacher and no average response from two ONYS Basic Education Teachers.

TABLE 6.25

Number of Sessions, Per Week, With Each Group of Basic Education Trainees

Number of Sessions	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
1	1	–	1
2	1	1	2
3	–	1	1
4	–	–	–
5	2	18	20
Over 5	1	8	9
Total	5	28	33

NOTE: Totals are greater than sample sizes due to multiple responses.

TABLE 6.26

Length of Class Sessions Taught By Basic Education Teachers

Length of Session	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
Under 1 hour	–	4	4
1 hour	3	3	6
2 hours	–	4	4
3 hours	–	–	–
4 hours	–	1	1
Total	3	12	15

NOTE: There was no response from one Basic Education Teacher, NYC. ONYS total is greater than the sample size due to multiple response.

Teaching Methods. When asked what teaching methods they used, basic education teachers most frequently mentioned practice sessions, group discussions, and demonstrations (Table 6.27). However, the next most frequent response was "lecture." Seven of the 13 basic education teachers indicated that they used the lecture method but only one of these was a basic education teacher from New York City. In view of the essentially remedial nature of basic education and the more than ordinary need for individualized instruction, it might be appropriate to investigate a possible over-emphasis on teacher-centered instruction in the centers outside of New York City. It is rather interesting that the lecture method is used so frequently since teachers in centers outside of New York City indicated the lecture method most frequently as being the least effective (Table 6.28) and group discussions and panels as being the most effective methods (Table 6.29).

TABLE 6.27

Teaching Methods Used As Reported By Basic Education Teachers

Methods	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
Practice Sessions	2	8	10
Group Discussion	2	7	9
Demonstration	1	8	9
Lecture	1	6	7
Programmed Instruction	1	5	6
Role Playing	2	2	4
Films, T.V.	–	4	4
Field Visits	1	–	1
Special Guests	–	1	1
Panels, Forums	–	–	–
Other	1	9	10
Total	11	50	61

NOTE: Totals are greater than sample sizes due to multiple response.

TABLE 6.28

Least Effective Teaching Methods Reported By Basic Education Teachers

Methods	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
Lecture	–	5	5
Programmed Instruction	1	2	3
Group Discussions	–	1	1
Special Guests	–	1	1
Films, T.V.	–	1	1
Demonstration	–	–	–
Role Playing	–	–	–
Field Visits	–	–	–
Panels, Forums	–	–	–
Practice Sessions	–	–	–
Other	1	–	1
Total	2	10	12

NOTE: There were no responses from two Basic Education Teachers, NYC. Multiple responses were given by one Basic Education Teacher, ONYS.

TABLE 6.29

Most Effective Teaching Methods Reported by Basic Education Teachers

Methods	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
Group Discussion	2	4	6
Panels, Forums	1	5	6
Demonstration	1	3	4
Films, T.V.	1	3	4
Role Playing	3	–	3
Field Visits	1	1	2
Special Guests	1	–	1
Practice Sessions	–	1	1
Lecture	–	–	–
Programmed Instruction	–	–	–
Other	–	5	5
Total	10	22	32

NOTE: Totals are greater than sample sizes due to multiple responses.

Assessment of Trainee Learning. None of the basic education teachers who gave scoreable responses indicated that their trainees were learning less than adequately (Table 6.30). However, when asked what methods were used to judge how well trainees were learning, only 3 of 35 respondents indicated that standardized achievement tests were used (Table 6.31). It would seem clear as well as surprising that standardized instruments are not being sufficiently used in the area of basic education. It is recommended that the use of such instruments in MDT basic education programs be evaluated to determine if the accuracy of assessing trainee learning can be improved.

TABLE 6.30

Basic Education Teachers Judgments of Trainee Learning in Basic Education

Judgment of Learning	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
Well	1	4	5
Adequately	1	5	6
Poorly	–	–	–
Total	2	9	11

NOTE: There were no responses from two NYC Basic Education Teachers.

TABLE 6.31

Methods Used By Basic Education Teachers To Judge Trainee Learning

Methods	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
Standardized Achievement Tests	–	3	3
Own Teacher-Made Achievement Tests	3	6	9
Teacher-Made Achievement Tests Provided by Center	–	–	–
Evaluation of Classroom Performance by Trainee	2	5	7
Evaluation of Written Assignments	3	5	8
Other	2	6	8
Total	10	25	35

NOTE: Totals are greater than sample sizes due to multiple responses.

Teaching Difficulty. Three of 4 basic education teachers in New York City said that MDT teaching was easier than other basic education positions because they found the adults that they worked with more eager to learn. The fourth teacher felt that the difficulty was comparable but that the problems were different. On the other hand, 4 of 7 basic education teachers in centers outside of New York City indicated that they found MDT teaching situations more difficult than elsewhere. Two of the reasons given had to do with the conditions of work and two had to do with trainee characteristics. Certainly the number of responses prohibits concluding that the differing perceptions of MDT teaching difficulty between New York City centers and those outside of New York City are significant. It might be worth exploring this issue further with a larger sample.

MDT Staff Recommendations. Four of 5 center administrators in New York City made recommendations for improving the basic education program: closer coordination of the basic education program with the skills training program and more vocationally related materials used in basic education (2); regular inservice sessions on a city-wide basis; increased supervisory help (2). The 6 responding center administrators, Other New York State, made the following recommendations: inservice training (2); instructional materials more related to skills area; teachers who are more appropriate by background for working with disadvantaged populations (2); reduced class sizes.

The 4 responding skills teacher supervisors in New York City made the following recommendations: arrange for basic education to precede skills training rather than conduct concurrently; basic education should teach directly for trade requirements at appropriate points in training; formal grammar and speech should be taught; more male teachers.

The 11 skills teacher supervisors in centers outside of New York City made the following kinds of recommendations: basic education instruction should be job related (2); materials used should be relevant to skills area (2); for this kind of population, basic education should be less academic and less formal; more basic education hours for each trainee (2); more time for individual tutoring of trainees; better fringe benefits for employees such as sick pay; stability of job position (2).

Statewide, there was only one response from a basic education supervisor: provide more funds to hire more basic education teachers.

The following are comments from 4 counseling supervisors throughout the State: more careful selection and training of staff (2); provide more teachers so as to improve the teacher-student ratio; provide more basic education supervisors.

Three blue collar skills teachers in New York City centers made the following recommendations: basic education should be taught in shop; basic education needs improvement in content and method; stop the loss of dedicated teachers by providing encouragement and more remuneration.

Nine white collar skills teachers in New York City made the following recommendations: provide more reading experience; emphasize English grammar for office clerks; more computation in drugs and solutions; longer classes (3); provide basic education prior to skills training (2); hire basic education teachers on demonstrated ability in the teaching of reading.

Four blue collar skills teachers in centers outside of New York City made the following recommendations: closer relationship with vocational teaching (3); provide more experience in reading and comprehension.

Eight white collar skills teachers in centers outside of New York City recommended: more math instruction; more practice in spelling and reading; more individualized instruction; increase the amount of time available for basic education (2); more personnel (2); more evaluative tests to determine progress.

Four basic education teachers from New York City made the following recommendations: more job preparation time; more coordination between centers so that experiences can be shared; remove stricture that everything must be vocationally oriented; emphasize adjustment to work life and de-emphasize skills instruction.

From 9 basic education teachers, Other New York State, came the following recommendations: don't tie basic education to skills training; spend more time coordinating with skills teachers; provide more basic education teachers; provide more trainee contact hours in basic education; provide reading specialists; provide a part-time speech therapist; provide additional supervisory personnel (8 instructors recommended that additional staff be provided to lengthen the trainee contact time).

Four counselors throughout the State recommended the following: use experimental approach with teaching machines; provide additional programs such as preparation for high school equivalency examination; provide basic education early in the morning; limit classes to 15 to 20 students.

It may be seen from the foregoing that the issue and problem of basic education elicits considerable agreement as to its widespread need but that specific recommendations for improvement differ greatly depending largely on the specialty and commitment of the respondent.

Counseling

It is a common assumption of many educators that trainees in programs such as MDT require counseling. Equally common among such educators is disagreement concerning the appropriate methods and contents of counseling. This section illustrates these issues and suggests areas for further investigation. Although only one paragraph deals with other supporting services, it was not our intention to indicate that such services are of less importance than counseling. Indeed, when such services are not available, training is seriously handicapped. We have not dealt with this important area more extensively because it required more intensive study beyond our resources.

Counselor Autonomy. One gets the impression that counselors have more control over determining the content of their professional activities than most other professional staff members. Of 4 counselors in New York City responding to the question "How is the nature of the day-to-day counselor's job here decided?", two indicated that they decided for themselves and two indicated that it was a general agreement between them and center administration. Of 7 counselors responding in centers outside of New York City, 4 replied that they determined the nature of their activities themselves, 2 indicated that the decision was made in conjunction with administration and 1 indicated that the center director made this decision.

Enrollment. All 13 center administrators and 4 counselor supervisors (there was no response from 1 supervisor) indicated that 100 percent of trainees receive counseling. This suggests a possibility that all trainees receive counseling routinely whether they need it or not. It might be advisable to look into the matter of developing screening procedures for trainees which would determine whether they need counseling and if so, what type.

Counselor Functions. We asked questions to determine whether the following were included as part of the counselor's functions: individual counseling, group counseling, orientation of trainees and home contacts (Table 6.32). It is interesting to note that all 4 supervisors who responded to this question and all 12 counselors indicated that individual counseling and group counseling were part of the counselor's functions. All 4 counselor supervisors in the State and the 7 counselors in centers outside of New York City saw orientation as part of their functions while 2 of the 5 counselors in New York City did not report this as included in their activities.

A dramatic contrast between counselor supervisors and counselors was found in the number of responses to home contacts. Three of the 4 counselor supervisors mentioned home contacts as a function of the counselor while only 2 of the 12 counselors reported this as one of their functions (both of these counselors were in centers outside of New York City). One wonders if counselors in the MDT program view their services as a traditional function where counselors meet with trainees in a group in a classroom or behind a desk in individual counseling. We do not have sufficient evidence to draw such a conclusion but we feel the trend suggests that it would be worthwhile to assess the MDT statewide counseling program to determine whether the approaches and settings are appropriate for the populations being served.

TABLE 6.32

Functions of Counselors As Reported By Counselor Supervisors and Counselors

Functions	NYC Counselor Supervisors	NYC Counselors	ONYS Counselor Supervisors	ONYS Counselors	Total NYS Counselor Supervisors	Total NYS Counselors
Individual Counseling	1	5	3	7	4	12
Group Counseling	1	5	3	7	4	12
Orientation	1	3	3	7	4	10
Home Contacts	–	–	3	2	3	2
Total	3	13	12	23	15	36

NOTE: Totals are greater than sample sizes due to multiple responses.

None of the four counselor supervisors reported that counselors spent more than 50 percent of their time on individual counseling while 5 of the 7 responding counselors indicated that they spent more than 50 percent of their time in that activity; 4 counselors reported that they spent more than 60 percent of their time in individual counseling (Table 6.33). The discrepancy between reporting groups is even greater in New York City where the citywide counselor supervisor reported that counselors spend 25 percent of their time in individual counseling while 3 of the 4 counselors reported that they spend over 50 percent of their time in this activity; the remaining counselor reported that he spent between 30 percent and 40 percent of his time in individual counseling. Statewide, counselors also reported that they spend more time in individual counseling than their supervisors indicated.

TABLE 6.33

Percent Of Time Spent By Counselors In Individual Counseling As Reported By Counselor Supervisors And Counselors

Percent of Time	NYC Counselor Supervisor	NYC Counselor	ONYS Counselor Supervisor	ONYS Counselor	Total NYS Counselor Supervisor	Total NYS Counselor
21 – 30	1	–	–	–	1	–
31 – 40	–	1	–	–	–	1
41 – 50	–	–	3	1	3	1
51 – 60	–	1	–	–	–	1
61 – 70	–	1	–	1	–	2
71 – 80	–	1	–	–	–	1
81 – 90	–	–	–	1	–	1
Total	1	4	3	3	4	7

NOTE: There were no responses from one ONYS Counselor Supervisor, one NYC Counselor; four ONYS Counselors.

Statewide, counselors also tended to report that they spend less time in group counseling than their supervisors reported (Table 6.34).

Again, the contrast is greater in New York City. The citywide counselor supervisor reported that 50 percent of the counselors' time is spent in group counseling while 3 of the 4 counselors reporting indicated that they spent 40 percent or less of their time on individual counseling; the remaining counselor reported that he spent between 41 percent and 50 percent of his time in this activity.

While the number of respondents is insufficient to draw conclusions, the data indicates a discrepancy between counselors and their supervisors as to amount of time spent on various functions. We recommend that this matter be examined in further depth.

TABLE 6.34

Percent of Time Spent By Counselors In Group Counseling As Reported By Counselor Supervisors and Counselors

Percent of Time	NYC Counselor Supervisor	NYC Counselor	ONYS Counselor Supervisor	ONYS Counselor	Total NYS Counselor Supervisor	Total NYS Counselor
0 – 10	–	–	–	1	–	1
11 – 20	–	1	1	–	1	1
21 – 30	–	1	1	2	1	3
31 – 40	–	1	1	–	1	1
41 – 50	1	1	–	–	1	1
Total	1	4	3	3	4	7

NOTE: There were no responses from one ONYS Counselor Supervisor, one NYC Counselor, four ONYS Counselors.

Group Counseling. Counselors typically report that they see between 3 and 6 groups a week in group counseling (Table 6.35). Each group usually meets once a week for approximately an hour (Tables 6.36 and 6.37). The size of groups usually ranged between 11 and 20 trainees (Table 6.38). Counselors outside New York City tend to see more groups and in some instances for a shorter period of time with fewer trainees than New York City counselors.

TABLE 6.35

Number of Groups of Trainees Seen Each Week By Counselors

Number of Groups	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
3	2	–	2
4	3	2	5
5	–	2	2
6	–	2	2
Total	5	6	11

NOTE: There was no response from one ONYS Counselor.

TABLE 6.36

Number of Sessions Per Week For Each Counseling Group As Reported By Counselors

Number of Sessions	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
1	3	5	8
2	–	–	–
3	–	1	1
4	–	1	1
5	1	–	1
Total	4	7	11

NOTE: There was no response from one Counselor, NYC.

TABLE 6.37

Length of Group Counseling Sessions As Reported By Counselors

Minutes Per Session	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
41 – 50	–	3	3
51 – 60	5	4	9
Total	5	7	12

TABLE 6.38

Number of Trainees In A Group As Reported By Counselors

Number of Trainees	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
5 – 10	–	3	3
11 – 20	5	3	8
Total	5	6	11

NOTE: There was no response from one ONYS Counselor.

Both counselors and their supervisors reported with equal frequency that counselors dealt with all of the areas on which we questioned them: learning difficulties, vocational choices, family problems, motivational problems, and personal problems. A qualitative analysis of these responses suggested that highest priority in group counseling might be given by counselors to motivational problems as they relate to job training. Also, work-related matters which interfere with job training, such as the control of anger, were mentioned frequently as group counseling content.

Individual Counseling. Counselors reported that individual counseling consists of one or two sessions a week, usually for 35 to 45 minutes but often longer or shorter (Tables 6.39 and 6.40). There was quite a range in the number of trainees seen each week as reported by counselors (Table 6.41). The wide range of individual counseling loads coupled with the group counseling variation suggests that different centers may evaluate the relative importance of group and individual counseling differently. If so, it would be interesting to learn what criteria are used in the differential evaluation.

TABLE 6.39

Number of Sessions Per Week In Individual Counseling
Reported by Counselors

Number of Sessions	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
1	2	2	4
2	2	3	5
3	–	–	–
4	–	–	–
5	–	–	–
1 per Month	1	1	2
Total	5	6	11

NOTE: There was no response from one ONYS Counselor.

TABLE 6.40

Number of Minutes Per Session In Individual Counseling Reported by Counselors

Number of Minutes	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
5 – 15	1	–	1
16 – 25	–	2	2
26 – 35	2	–	2
36 – 45	2	2	4
46 – 55	–	–	–
As long as needed	–	2	2
Total	5	6	11

NOTE: There was no response from one ONYS Counselor.

TABLE 6.41

Number of Trainees Per Week Seen In Individual Counseling By Counselors During Peak Periods

Numbers of Trainees	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
0 – 10	–	–	–
11 – 20	2	1	3
21 – 30	–	2	2
31 – 40	1	2	3
41 – 50	1	1	2
51 – 60	1		1
Total	5	6	11

NOTE: There was no response from one ONYS Counselor.

As in the group counseling situation, counselors and counselor supervisors reported with about equal frequency that they dealt with all of the counseling options on which we questioned them: learning difficulties, vocational choices, family problems, motivational problems, and personal problems. We got the impression from a content analysis of the data that there might be somewhat more of a tendency for counselors to deal in individual counseling with personal problems that were directly related to training or work. However, we also got the impression that counselors did not perceive great distinctions between the purposes of group counseling and individual counseling. This is a matter which perhaps merits closer study.

Assessment of Counseling Effectiveness. When questioned, 8 of the 12 counselors in the sample indicated their counseling was effective for trainees; 3 could not tell and 1 indicated that it was not effective. When asked what criteria were used for judging how effective their counseling was, the responses suggested that the methods usually consisted of unsystematic reports from former trainees and subjective judgments concerning the progress of the trainee's life. It would seem that there is a need to develop a more objective, systematic appraisal of the effectiveness of counseling.

Counselor Supervisor Load. In centers outside of New York City, 4 counselor supervisors reported that they supervised between 1 and 5 counselors at the present time and that they supervised between 1 and 6 counselors when they were operating at maximum capacity with a complete staff. On the other hand, the New York City citywide supervisor reported that she was currently directing the activities of between 18 and 20 counselors and that this figure had risen to between 61 and 71 during those periods when they had been operating at maximum capacity with a full staff. During the periods of maximum capacity she had 2 or 3 assistants, but presently must provide counselor supervision herself as well as citywide coordination.

In our opinion, the supervisory situation for counselors in New York City is critical. It is impossible for a citywide supervisor with administrative responsibilities to provide the kind of supervision necessary for counselors in 5 different locations. We recommend that counseling supervision be provided in New York City at the ratio of 1 supervisor for 5 counselors.

Counseling Difficulty. Counselors were divided in their opinions of the difficulty of MDT counseling compared to other counseling situations; about half felt that MDT counseling was more difficult while the other half felt that it was of about equal difficulty (Table 6.42). Of those who commented further, one stated that MDT was more difficult because of the need to deal with an "abnormal range of intelligence, ability, and problematic people." Another indicated that it was more difficult because it was necessary to orient the trainee to counseling and its purposes so that he would want it. One of those who felt that the MDT situation was as difficult as other situations explained that he was comparing it to Neighborhood Youth Corps counseling. On the other hand, all counselors except one felt that the MDT counseling situation was more flexible than others in meeting trainee needs (Table 6.43).

TABLE 6.42

Degree of Difficulty of MDT Counseling Compared to Other Counseling Situations As Reported By Counselors

Degree of Difficulty	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
More difficult	2	2	4
About the same	2	2	4
Less difficult	—	1	1
Total	4	5	9

NOTE: There were no responses from one NYC counselor and two ONYS Counselors.

TABLE 6.43

Degree of Flexibility of MDT Counseling Compared to Other Counseling Situations As Reported By Counselors

Degree of Flexibility	NYC	ONYS	Total NYS
More flexible	3	7	10
About the same	–	–	–
Less flexible	1	–	1
Total	4	7	11

NOTE: There was no response from one NYC Counselor.

Other Supporting Services. Most MDT staff indicated that there were a large number of social services needed by trainees which the centers were not able to supply. These services included medical, dental, legal, child-care, and financial assistance. In most instances these services are provided by referral to already overtaxed and inadequately supported community centers and agencies. High on the list of these needed services were medical, dental, and child-care services, the latter a particular necessity for mothers who wish to avail themselves of job training but need assistance in taking care of small children at home. The need for supporting services has been well documented in other MDT studies. As in New York State, most programs generally rely on referrals to other sources for these services. However, this procedure requires that trainees become familiar with a variety of different locations with their varying agency requirements, a situation that can often be discouraging and confusing, particularly if the services are inadequate. It might be borthwhile to explore the possibility of creating a centralized facility which could provide under one roof all of the myriad supporting services critically needed by trainees in order to minimize the negative influence that deprivation of these services has on success in job training.

MDT Staff Recommendations. Three center administrators outside of New York City recommended additional staff, formal guidance courses for staff, and more community involvement and family visits on the part of counselors. Other comments from center administrators included changing the title from "counselor" to "personnel service advisor" to minimize trainee resistance to the terms guidance and counselor; development of an affiliation with a university which would include using graduate students in counseling on site; more involvement in group guidance work and sensitivity training; more non-white counselors. Center administrators in New York City recommended more black counselors; counseling more directly related to vocational area than personal area; more on-site supervisors; inservice training; rethinking of the rationale for group counseling.

Skills teacher supervisors outside New York City included three who recommended an improvement in the counselor-trainee ratio. Skills teacher supervisors in New York City recommended that something be done to minimize the turnover in counselors; permit trainees to decide when they need counseling; find counselors who are less cerebral and college oriented and who have more sensitivity to thinking processes associated with trainees typically found in vocational training.

The most frequent recommendation from counselor supervisors were for additional staff. Other recommendations included: more inservice training; more clerical help; the development of a stronger team approach with basic and skills training; preservice training for skills and basic education teachers in counseling.

A strong, persistent, and general theme emerged from the request of skills instructors to make recommendations for the improvement of the counseling program. Both blue collar and white collar instructors throughout the State complained that while counselors may be well intentioned, they are not sufficiently sensitive to and oriented to the world of work. They report that very often these academically oriented white collar professionals are more concerned with personal adjustment counseling than they are with vocational counseling. They suggest that in many cases where counselors recognize the necessity for integrating their counseling with vocational training and the world of work they are unable to do so because of their own backgrounds and lack of experience with other than professional occupations. This theme was repeated so frequently and with such vehemence that it seems there is a need for a more sophisticated selection and evaluation of counselors' sensitivity to the life-styles and thinking processes of MDT trainees.

The few comments obtained from basic education personnel were of a general nature and did not lend themselves to summarization.

There were no general themes in the few cases where counselors made recommendations for improving the counseling program. The one generalization that might be made is that counselors' concerns seemed to be unique to each center setting rather than generalizable to the counseling program citywide or statewide.

CHAPTER VII

THE PROGRAM AS VIEWED BY CURRENT TRAINEES

In Chapter IV, the methods and procedures for conducting the study of the multi-center training programs were presented. It was indicated there that the substudy of trainees currently enrolled was included as part of the overall plan of site visitations. The Proposed Site Visit Schedule (Appendix B) illustrates the working plan for each visitation and shows how the administration of questionnaires to trainees was correlated with the other activities of the study team. In this chapter we present a description of the current trainee sample, the findings and a discussion of their implications.

The Sample

The sample was selected so that four skills classes in each center were identified for inclusion. Every effort was made to include groups enrolled in those occupational training areas most representative of current MDT training programs in New York State. Accordingly, most groups selected for the sample were those receiving training in auto body and auto mechanics; production machine operator; licensed practical nurse; and clerical occupations. Additional occupational areas were selected to secure a sample of the entire range of training programs, with particular emphasis on "upgrading" occupations and a balance of blue-collar and white-collar occupations. A strenuous attempt was made to exclude those groups of trainees in the first few weeks of training. This attempt was not completely successful, in part because of the protracted delays in MDT recycling that occurred during this phase of the Study, and in part because of problems engendered by continuous enrollment practices in some centers. The entire sample, by trainee program, is summarized in Table 7.1. The number of groups was 15 in New York City, 33 elsewhere in New York State, a total of 48 groups Statewide. The proportion of blue collar trainees in New York City is much lower than for the rest of the State, 32 percent as against 54 percent. However, New York City is primarily a white collar economy; and it may well be that our distribution is appropriate. A further note is pertinent: "Other Blue Collar" for Other New York State frequently includes variations on Production Machine Operator and these totals could well be combined.

TABLE 7.1

Current Trainees: Distribution By Training Program

	New York City		Other New York State	
Training Area	N	%	N	%
Blue Collar				
Auto	10	7	83	22
Household Appl. Rep.	8	5	9	2
Woodworking	11	8	—	—
Production Mach. Oper.	17	12	19	5
Other Blue Collar	—	—	95	25
Total	46	32	206	54
White Collar				
Business Mach. Oper.	27	18	—	—
Licensed Practical Nurse	18	12	24	6
Stenographer	20	14	18	5
Clerk	19	13	58	15
Bookkeeping	11	8	—	—
Duplicating Mach.	5	3	14	4
Other White Collar	—	—	63	16
Total	100	68	177	46
TOTAL	146	100	383	100

Procedures

An instrument was developed in the form of an anonymous check list consisting of items to elicit several types of data: trainee's background, needs, his experience in specific areas of instruction and supplement services, his attitudes toward training, his expectations and his perception of gains accrued from the training program. An initial form of the check list was administered by several members of the Study staff to several trainee groups in each of four multi-centers, and was subjected to several revisions prior to its use with the selected sample groups.

Administration of the MDT Trainee Check List was an integral part of the site visits conducted by the Study staff. Detailed schedules were developed for each center, prior to the visit (by telephone and by correspondence between the center administrator and members of the Study staff), so that administration of the Check List could proceed in a given class during the hour when the instructor of that class was being interviewed. In several instances, in which two instructors were being interviewed simultaneously, class groups were combined.

All trainees in the selected sample groups who were present on the scheduled date were given the MDT Trainee Check List. Procedures for administration of the Check List included an informal introduction to the MDT Study, a description of the purposes of the Check List and an explanation of the general format. It was explained to the trainees that the instrument was not a test and would not be administered as a test, that confidentiality of responses would be fastidiously respected and that candid responses would have real value for future programs. Every effort was made to elicit the interested cooperation of the trainees and to avoid the introduction of any response sets. Trainees were encouraged to request assistance in spelling and in word or item meaning and to take as much time as needed for thoughtful responses.

Trainee groups' responses to the Check List progressed in almost every instance from initial politeness to eventual interest, concern and full cooperation. Many trainees labored over responses which they wished to give to open-ended items included at the end of the form. Ten to fifteen minute discussions which followed the administration of the Check List were frequently spirited and interested exchanges. Observations and comments during these sessions are utilized in the section following the quantitative tabular presentation.

The Findings

As in the case of all the data presented in this report it was appropriate to analyze the material in terms of a New York City—Other New York State dichotomy. With few exceptions the tables which follow are divided accordingly. In the first section the data are descriptive providing background and characteristics of the trainees themselves. The second section deals with trainee attitudes towards MDT programs. The final section presents the qualitative comments drawn from the four open-end questions in the questionnaire.

Trainee Characteristics. Tables 7.2 to 7.5 present sex, age, ethnic background, marital status, educational level, months in training program and status three months prior to training, of the trainees. The New York City sample was smaller than desirable but in many respects certain similarities and differences between it and the Other New York State sample, yield interesting comparisons, particularly when viewed in the light of other data.

Sex. More than half of the Other New York State sample of trainees were males while slightly more than half of the New York City sample were females (Table 7.2). The Other New York State ratio is more similar to the 1968 federal figure for the State as a whole (Table 3.2). It may not be unusual that the New York City sample

is more heavily female since as mentioned earlier, New York City has primarily a white collar economy; hence the large proportion of females in white collar clerical training programs (Table 7.1) may be appropriate from a labor market point of view.

TABLE 7.2

Characteristics of Current Trainees: Sex, Age, Ethnic Background and Marital Status

	New York City		Other New York State	
	N	%	N	%
Sex				
Male	67	46	217	57
Female	78	53	157	41
No Answer	1	1	9	2
Total	146	100	383	100
Age				
16 – 18	6	4	56	15
19 – 21	40	27	88	23
22 – 25	24	16	59	15
26 – 35	38	26	94	25
36 – 55	24	16	65	17
No Answer	14	10	21	5
Total	146	99*	383	100
Ethnic Background				
Black	74	51	121	32
White	15	10	180	47
Puerto Rican	19	13	7	2
Indian	8	5	6	1
No Answer	30	21	69	18
Total	146	100	383	100
Marital Status				
Single	74	51	176	46
Married	35	24	116	30
Separated	17	12	43	11
Divorced	4	3	13	3
Widowed	11	7	9	2
No Answer	5	3	26	7
Total	146	100	383	99*

*Percentages do not add to 100 due to rounding.

Age. There was little difference in age between the samples with the exception of a higher proportion under 19 in the Other New York State group (Table 7.2). It should be noted that over one-third of the total State sample are twenty-one or younger and that about half are twenty-five or younger.

Ethnic Background. Almost two-thirds of the New York City trainees were black or Puerto Rican while about one-third of the trainees in centers outside New York City fell in this category (Table 7.2). The high percentage of no answers (about 20 percent) indicates that these should be considered minimum sample estimates. The sample proportions are close to the general population proportions in the geographical areas of the two samples. However, one can question the appropriateness of general population ratios as guidelines for MDT trainee population ratios. In any event, our data here are insufficient to be conclusive but are suggestive enough to warrant further study.

Marital Status. There was little difference between the two groups in marital status (Table 7.2). The data indicate that Statewide, about 70 to 75 percent of the trainees are unmarried. Time and resources did not permit the cross-tabulations that might explain this phenomenon. A combination of factors such as the federal mandate to serve larger numbers of younger (hence unmarried) trainees, and to a lesser extent the need of separated, divorced and widowed females to gain work skills in order to support themselves and their families, could contribute to this high percentage.

Educational Level. The similarities in educational level between the two samples are quite striking, e.g., the percentages for those completing the ninth and tenth grades are identical and those completing the eleventh and twelfth grades are practically identical (Table 7.3). The fact that more than one-third of the group are high school graduates is especially notable; this is comparable to the statewide figure shown in Table 3.2.

TABLE 7.3

Characteristics of Current Trainees: Educational Level Completed

	New York City		Other New York State	
Grade	N	%	N	%
1	–	–	2	1
2	–	–	2	1
3	1	1	1	–
4	–	–	–	–
5	1	1	–	–
6	1	1	10	3
7	2	1	9	2
8	6	4	40	10
9	18	12	47	12
10	21	14	53	14
11	19	13	39	10
12	53	36	128	33
13	7	5	4	1
14	4	3	5	1
No answer	13	9	43	11
Total	146	100	383	99*

*Percentage does not add to 100 due to rounding.

Months in Training Program. The difference between the samples in months in training at the time of visitation is especially notable (Table 7.4). The New York City group is a long-term group with over 70 percent in the program for four months or longer, and only 6 percent for one month or less. This reflected the long delay in refunding in New York City: very few new programs had begun in recent months. The rest of the State showed almost an exact opposite picture with less than 25 percent in training four months or more and about half for one month or less. All data in the rest of this chapter should be viewed with this important fact kept fully in mind.

TABLE 7.4

Characteristics of Current Trainees: Months In Training Program

	New York City		Other New York State	
Months	N	%	N	%
1 or less	10	6	189	49
2 months	7	4	84	22
3 months	19	12	16	4
4 or more	110	71	84	22
No answer	10	6	10	3
Total	156	99*	383	100

*Percentage does not add to 100 due to rounding.

Status Three Months Prior to Training. Despite the great difference between the samples in number of months in the training program, they were more similar than different in pre-training status. Throughout the state about half the group had been in some kind of job before training, with an unexpectedly high proportion in full-time jobs. Only about 25 percent reported that they had been unemployed (Table 7.5).

TABLE 7.5

Characteristics of Current Trainees: Status Three Months Prior to Training

	New York City		Other New York State	
	N	%	N	%
Full-time work	74	51	161	42
Part-time work	13	9	44	11
Unemployed	39	27	92	24
On welfare	9	6	44	11
Other	9	6	24	6
No answer	2	1	18	5
Total	146	100	383	99*

*Percentage does not add to 100 due to rounding.

Trainee Attitudes. Trainee attitudes are reported here in the broad areas of reasons for wanting training, the training program and services, and outlook for future jobs. While the questionnaire items used to obtain actual information for the previous section were categorical, those used for the trainee attitudes reported here were scaled so as to yield a measure of intensity.

Reasons for Wanting Training. Table 7.6 indicates that trainees wanted training because they felt it would lead to stable employment at a reasonable rate of pay and work that they found interesting, conditions which evidently had not existed in the jobs they had held prior to MDT training. It is interesting to note that where differences exist between the New York City and Other New York State samples they are very small.

TABLE 7.6

Attitudes of Current Trainees: Relative Importance of Reasons for Wanting Training

	Very Important				A Little Important				Not Important				No Answer			
	NYC		ONYS		NYC		ONYS		NYC		ONYS		NYC		ONYS	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
To get a job that is steady and regular.	120	82	304	79	12	8	36	9	3	2	17	4	11	8	26	7
To get a job that pays more money.	112	77	291	76	17	12	53	14	6	4	19	5	11	8	20	5
To get a more interesting job.	113	77	291	76	16	11	50	13	7	5	19	5	10	7	23	6
To get a different kind of job than I had.	106	73	278	73	17	12	37	10	10	7	38	10	13	9	30	7
To learn more about the job I already had.	43	29	98	26	12	8	34	9	71	49	196	51	20	14	55	4
To get an easier job.	35	24	71	19	42	29	83	22	50	34	185	48	19	13	44	12
Just to get a job, no matter what it is.	20	14	43	11	21	14	33	9	73	50	235	61	32	22	71	19

The Training Program and Services. Table 7.7 indicates that New York City trainees do not have as high an opinion of MDT teaching as trainees in the rest of the State. This is consistent for reading, writing, arithmetic and job requirements. Trainees in both samples tend to rate teaching in skills higher than in basic education areas; there is a marked tendency for trainees outside New York City to rate teaching in skills higher than basic education. Furthermore, it is clear that the overwhelming majority of all trainees rate all of the areas as either "very good" or "good" with only a very small proportion rating it "poor." Table 7.8, which is concerned with the approaches the teachers use, again shows the much more favorable attitude of Other New York State trainees as compared to those in New York City. Similarly, very few in either case evaluate teachers explanations, encouragement or understanding as being poor. It is interesting to note that the ratings in Table 7.8 are higher than those in Table 7.7. This may be due to the more specific nature of the matter being rated.

Table 7.9 evaluates a number of aspects of the programs by component. It is noteworthy that the highest opinion both in New York City and the rest of the State is of "skills training." "Basic education" is the only area which is viewed more positively in New York City than in the rest of the State. "Classrooms" and "counseling" are both rated somewhat lower in New York City. The one area of generally negative agreement across the State is "toilet facilities."

TABLE 7.7

Attitudes of Current Trainees: Evaluation of Teaching

	Very Good				Good				Fair				Poor				No Answer			
	NYC		ONYS		NYC		ONYS		NYC		ONYS		NYC		ONYS		NYC		ONYS	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Arithmetic	51	35	187	49	47	32	96	25	25	17	50	13	11	8	16	4	12	8	34	9
Reading	44	30	143	37	46	32	93	24	30	21	45	12	7	5	12	3	19	13	90	24
Writing	37	25	130	34	38	26	79	21	30	21	44	11	5	3	15	4	36	25	115	30
Things needed for future job.	56	38	237	62	37	25	71	19	18	12	23	6	7	5	9	2	28	19	43	11

TABLE 7.8

Attitudes of Current Trainees: Evaluation of Teachers' Approaches

	Very Good				Good				Fair				Poor				No Answer			
	NYC		ONYS		NYC		ONYS		NYC		ONYS		NYC		ONYS		NYC		ONYS	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Explain things to you.	71	49	269	70	45	31	80	21	17	12	22	6	3	2	3	1	10	7	9	2
Encourage you.	66	45	236	62	43	29	86	22	20	14	37	10	5	3	5	1	12	8	19	5
Try to understand you.	58	40	233	61	47	32	77	20	23	16	41	11	8	5	12	3	10	7	20	5

TABLE 7.9

Attitudes of Current Trainees: Opinions of Selected Aspects of Multi-Centers

	Like Very Much				Like A Little				Neither Like Nor Dislike				Dislike A Little				Dislike A Lot				No Answer			
	NYC		ONYS		NYC		ONYS		NYC		ONYS		NYC		ONYS		NYC		ONYS		NYC		ONYS	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Basic Education	90	62	215	56	32	23	65	17	8	5	32	8	2	1	8	2	2	1	27	7	12	8	36	9
Skills Training	114	78	317	83	15	10	25	6	4	3	13	3	1	1	2	1	3	2	4	1	9	6	22	6
Equipment	79	54	261	68	33	23	41	10	13	9	27	7	1	1	8	2	7	5	10	3	13	9	36	9
Classrooms	61	42	221	58	36	25	59	15	26	18	41	11	5	3	13	3	5	3	11	3	13	9	38	10
Counseling	59	40	230	60	29	20	45	12	23	16	48	13	4	3	5	1	10	7	5	1	21	14	50	13
Training Allow.	71	49	186	49	27	18	61	16	11	8	33	9	8	5	27	7	7	5	33	9	22	15	43	11
Fellow Trainees	86	59	229	60	29	20	59	15	13	9	33	9	3	2	6	2	2	1	2	1	13	9	54	14
Toilet Facilities	35	24	136	36	26	18	60	16	27	18	69	18	12	8	23	6	16	11	34	9	30	21	61	16

Table 7.10 shows trainees' perceptions of possible sources of help with personal problems. The fact that the highest rating is given to non-professionals, friends or relatives, by both samples is consistent with other studies with students in regular school programs. The Other New York State trainees were considerably more likely to see each of the choices as sources of help with personal problems. No doubt this is due to sample differences.

TABLE 7.10

Attitudes of Current Trainees: Perceptions of Possible Sources of Help with Personal Problems

	Yes				No				Don't Know				No Answer			
	NYC		ONYS		NYC		ONYS		NYC		ONYS		NYC		ONYS	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Teacher	59	40	194	51	18	12	30	8	46	32	117	31	23	16	42	11
Counselor	78	53	245	64	18	12	14	4	33	23	87	23	17	12	37	10
Supervisor	38	26	139	36	19	13	27	7	57	39	149	39	32	22	68	18
Friend or Relative	84	58	253	66	8	5	15	4	27	18	50	13	27	18	65	17
Other	14	10	47	12	2	1	8	2	16	11	55	14	113	77	273	71

Table 7.11 is concerned with trainees' perceptions of center services in legal, medical or family areas. The very high percent of "don't know" suggests that the centers may rarely be seen as a source of aid for meeting most important personal needs fundamental to readiness and staying power in training programs.

TABLE 7.11

Attitudes of Current Trainees: Perceptions of Center's Capacity to Arrange For Selected Services

	Yes				No				Don't Know			
	NYC		ONYS		NYC		ONYS		NYC		ONYS	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
See a doctor or a nurse	93	64	174	45	8	5	9	2	40	27	172	45
See a dentist	57	39	104	28	16	11	14	4	66	45	217	57
See a social worker	76	52	142	37	9	6	9	2	52	36	185	48
See a lawyer	16	11	84	22	13	9	11	3	101	69	231	60
Get someone to mind the children during training	13	9	49	13	14	10	12	3	73	50	215	56

Outlook for Future Jobs. The data in Table 7.12 suggests that the majority of trainees were not assigned to training different from that which they were seeking. However, more than a third of New York City trainees in our sample apparently did have other interests prior to their assignment.

TABLE 7.12

Attitudes of Current Trainees: "When You Asked for Training, Did You Want to Train for a Different Job Than the One You Are Now Training For?"

	New York City		Other New York State	
	N	%	N	%
Yes	54	37	69	18
No	77	53	284	74
Not sure	13	9	22	6
No answer	2	1	8	2
Total	146	100	383	100

Seventy-seven percent of the trainees in both New York City and in the rest of the State want the jobs for which they are currently being trained (Table 7.13). The great majority do feel that they are learning the things they need for their future jobs but there is apparently slightly greater uncertainty in the New York City group (Table 7.14). However, trainees are not as optimistic about job placement in occupations for which they are training as the proportions of favorable attitudes about the program might indicate; only 53 percent of the New York City group think their chances are good while 67 percent in the rest of the State express a positive outlook. The problem is not so much a pessimistic outlook (5 percent

TABLE 7.13

Attitudes of Current Trainees: Job Desired After Training

	New York City N	New York City %	Other New York State N	Other New York State %
The job I am being trained for	113	77	295	77
A better job	18	12	39	10
A different job	7	5	26	7
No answer	8	6	23	6
Total	146	100	383	100

TABLE 7.14

Attitudes of Current Trainees: "Are You Learning the Things You Need For The Job You Want?"

	New York City N	New York City %	Other New York State N	Other New York State %
Yes	107	73	324	85
No	7	5	14	4
Not sure	30	21	38	10
No answer	2	1	7	2
Total	146	100	383	101*

*Percentage does not add to 100 due to rounding.

in New York City and 4 percent Other New York State) but a high percent of uncertainty (Table 7.15). Finally, there is clearly an overwhelming feeling in both groups that their chances of finding the jobs they want would not have been as good without training (Table 7.16).

TABLE 7.15

Attitudes of Current Trainees: "Do You Think the Chances of Finding the Job You Want AFter This Training Are Good?"

	New York City N	New York City %	Other New York State N	Other New York State %
Yes	77	53	258	67
No	7	5	17	4
Not sure	57	39	100	26
No answer	5	3	8	2
Total	146	100	383	99*

*Percentage does not add to 100 due to rounding.

TABLE 7.16

Attitudes of Current Trainees: "Do You Think the Chances of Finding the Job You Want Would Have Been Just As Good Without This Training?"

	New York City N	New York City %	Other New York State N	Other New York State %
Yes	3	2	10	3
No	119	82	334	87
Not sure	20	14	26	7
No answer	4	3	13	3
Total	146	101*	383	100

*Percentage does not add to 100 due to rounding.

Summary of Qualitative Comments by Trainees

Turning first to New York City, the general pattern of open-end comments is very favorable. White collar skills trainees tend to be highly favorable both to training and to the teachers. There is concern about teachers having to leave the job because of the recycling problem. There does seem to be dissatisfaction about short lunch hours and unpleasant and inadequate eating facilities. The LPN group tended to be most verbal in responding to the open-end questions. They are most unhappy about the evening hours and the amount crammed into one year of training. Other problems are the difficulties in finding adequate child care.

It is noteworthy that both skills and basic education teachers are given high praise. It is also noteworthy that counselors are not often mentioned spontaneously. There is considerable pride and satisfaction in the amount trainees feel they have learned.

In general, blue collar trainees are less articulate, tend to write rather briefly and considerably fewer responded at all to the open-end questions. Some auto mechanics complain that there are not enough tools; others don't feel they have learned enough to hold down a job well. There is some mention of inadequate facilities including cafeteria, toilets, etc. However, there is more complaint about equipment, tools and working space than about the amenities.

Among Other New York State trainees the pervasive theme is also gratitude. There is widespread favorable comment on the staff, its friendliness and helpfulness. The short lunch hour and the long day received frequent negative mention. As against the general acceptance of the training as being appropriate for their level of background, there are a considerable number of others who wish more intensive, more thorough training. There is a recurrent complaint about the training allowance, its lateness and insufficiency. The range of physical plants makes the comments too specific to mention here except that bad toilet facilities, bad ventilation, poor equipment and poor food resources arouse strong feeling where they apparently are objectively serious problems. As in New York City the extent of white collar responses is greater than blue collar responses but, again, the general tone in most centers by most respondents is positive. A most interesting finding is that site observations by our teams are either corroborated or amplified by trainee comments.

Inasmuch as the foregoing is based on qualitative data it is interesting to note certain consistencies with the several sets of tables which describe the composition and background of the trainees as well as their attitudes and reactions to training. Insofar as their comments shed light on the training process, it may be said that there is such a widespread feeling of satisfaction that the exceptions are conspicuous. These exceptions should be identified as a target for deeper study but an important additional question is, what about those who dropped out of the program or couldn't get in?

Discussion of Current Trainee Data

Although no claim for representativeness is made and the numbers, especially in New York City, are small it is still clear that tapping several trainee sections in each center yielded a rather impressive body of data. Our reluctance to use the data in strict statistical terms stems primarily from the small numbers in the subsections and cells.

Relating these findings to other components of the center visitations permits certain generalizations to emerge. The prevailing mood, amongst administrators, teachers and trainees is apparently one of pride and satisfaction. We are well aware of how all of these sectors might wish to give "desirable" responses, to impress or persuade the interviewers. However, the anonymity of the trainee questionnaires and the internal consistency of the findings are most persuasive. For example, the fact that there are clearly older buildings in New

York City than in the rest of the State is supported by the considerable differences in attitudes toward the classrooms amongst the trainees. The observations by our teams concerning cafeteria, toilet, and other personal and living amenities are borne out by the staff and trainees. In other words, there are prevalent attitudes among trainees that are so much in keeping with the climate of the total MDT program that finding the exceptions and discrepancies would probably be helpful in identifying program needs and deficiencies.

We were prepared for serious and frequent dissatisfaction: the largely accepting attitude by trainees came as a real surprise for us. We shall have occasion to comment later on the apparently conformist attitudes of current trainees. However, when we also consider the findings in Chapter VI concerning the teachers and their methods, their attitudes and their evaluation of trainees, our previous judgment that the MDT program is geared to a rather receptive population, one that is not quite as "hardcore" as often portrayed, may be borne out.

It would appear that there is still some discrepancy between the large target group and those that are actually engaged in training. It is probable that there are differences in attitude between those who left the program and those who remained. The slow pace of trainee intake during our study meant that we had a small number of new or very recent trainees. While Chapter III shows that the MDT population of New York State has increasingly become disadvantaged in terms of black-white, lower educational level, youthfulness, nonemployment status, etc., our sample only partially manifests this trend. However, even the objective characteristics of disadvantage does not preclude the possession of certain attitudes of motivation and achievement which sufficiently resemble middle class attitudes and that may be selectively present in those that actually survive in training.

In regard to the trainees per se, the following are notable points for discussion. First, the group is comprised of more than one-third high school graduates; this is almost the same as the total population (Table 3.2). Secondly, the large number of full-time workers who came into MDT certainly raises many questions, not the least of which concerns the reliability of the responses. However, the consistency between New York City and the rest of the State in responses is truly startling. The magnitude of the proportion points to the probable validity of this finding, which suggests that the intent and purpose of the law should be reviewed in line with the way it is being actually implemented.

In the next and final chapter, implications of these and other findings of the study will be considered as a whole.

PART III

TOWARDS THE IMPROVEMENT OF MDTA PROGRAMS

CHAPTER VIII

IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY AND PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

In this concluding chapter our concern is to summarize the most pertinent observations and findings in the foregoing chapters, as well as to relate them to each other meaningfully. Certain implications that have previously been drawn may be repeated in this chapter, therefore, if they are either especially noteworthy or need to be related to other data. Having drawn together such findings and implications, we propose to present recommendations in several categories: first, recommendations that bear on the research and evaluation aspects of MDT; second, recommendations concerning the program itself: the training process, administration, staff and facilities; and, finally, we present implications for program policy and planning.

Evaluation: Issues and Implications

We consider the general issues of evaluation so important that, in a sense, the specific evaluation considerations of the present study may have their greatest significance if they are placed in the context of the larger problems of evaluation research.

The Problems of Evaluation. It is by now axiomatic that the evaluation of social and educational programs is the most talked about and least accomplished aspect of such programs. The problems are enormous and have been discussed by many, but perhaps most insightfully by Suchman in his volume on Evaluation Research. A comprehensive review of evaluation literature is obviously not in order: only the most salient issues and problems of evaluation are considered herein.

The problems start first with the simple fact that little or no funds have been provided for what everyone agrees is vital. Even when funds are written into programs they are often not used. Just as serious is that when the meager funds are used, it is not unusual for the evaluation to be post hoc, beginning only when a project is close to termination and when administrative demands force the matter.

It is further observed that legislative pressure, political demands, and a variety of external uses and abuses are the most common reasons for conducting evaluation studies. Recent history provides the examples of the headline-ridden Head Start evaluation or the politically-motivated Job Corps evaluation as stark evidence of the use to which social research is frequently put when the essential thrust is nonscientific.

The marked absence of MDT evaluation studies is not necessarily related to the foregoing, but it is important to clarify the climate of attitudes toward this kind of research. Even a thorough review reveals that there have been a mere handful of state evaluations, several attempts at cost-benefit analysis, a major review of the entire Act by Garth Mangum—all adding up to a minor effort after seven years of operation.

Another consideration which has had a serious deterrent effect on evaluation research is the fear, defensiveness, and threat which social programs in general experience as compared, say to engineering, business, or other areas where tangible, concrete, profitmaking products and outcomes are much more easily quantified and measured. Whether it be poverty program, education in general, manpower development and training, or welfare programs there is little consensus about their necessity, goals, outcomes, and continuity. The result is a pattern of inadequate funding, inadequate staffing, confused goals, arbitrary fund cutting, short-term expectations, recycling of problems and problem-solving processes, political pressure, waste, cynicism, and a host of other factors which make evaluation a minor or even futile effort in such a morass of difficulties. To some extent, MDT has been affected by this general social and political climate; and the student of MDT should be aware of it.

There is no equivocation either in these observations or in the recommendations which follow about the desirability of sound evaluation. It is felt very deeply that this is a major social need, that it should be done well, that it should be supported, that it should be respected, and that it should be utilized. However, when there is great ambiguity about its potential use, when there is continuous fiscal malnutrition, and when there is great discontinuity in these efforts, widespread and justified mistrust and suspicion must of necessity accompany such facts. As a result, rationally or irrationally, there is reluctance to cooperate with evaluation teams, there is fudging of data and there is a resort to extremes of response: white-washing and defensiveness, or cathartic complaint. Clearly, this in turn imposes serious methodological problems for evaluation.

Finally, the abysmal lack of usable data and report systems must be reiterated. Mangum states that in this regard MDTA is vastly superior to most other social programs but that its reporting system and available data are still inadequate to enable effective evaluation. Inasmuch as this has been a recurrent theme in this report it is important here to place it in perspective. Mangum's statement that "no federal manpower program currently has a reporting system capable of producing data of the kind and quality needed for evaluation" (1967, p. 3), is still true and is unfortunately applicable to New York State. Lacking a fundamental integrated reporting system, attempts to elicit data are beset with so many problems of sampling error, representativeness, and authority as to cast great doubt on evaluations derived from such data. Not only is the system as a whole inadequate but the irregularity, inconsistency, and incompleteness with

with which even adequate forms are submitted is another serious obstacle. The separation between Labor and Education Department records is another variation on this dismal theme. Altogether, it might be said that even the solution to the first three major aspects of evaluation, while necessary, would be insufficient so long as data in the age of the electronic computer remains so incomplete and inadequate.

Priorities for the Data System. The first area in which we presented findings was in regard to the data needs of MDT in New York State. Though not properly findings in the substantive sense, our analysis of these crucial methodological problems impels us to go beyond their implications and to present concrete recommendations for improvement.

First, the idea of the 101, 102, 103 Reporting System is a good one and the data collection forms are well designed to provide uniform national data. New York State should consider an intensive effort to better utilize this system. Specifically:

- The State should sponsor the development of a training package which could be given to officials responsible for filling out the different forms.
- There should be a systematic quality control effort involving spot checks.
- There should be provision for retaining copies of original data in Albany and for regular, probably monthly processing and reporting.

Such an effort would require close coordination between the Education and Labor Departments and would result in the creation of a meaningful data bank.

In addition, a similar effort should be made to improve OE 4021 performance. The form itself, in this case, is not especially useful in its present condition for reasons discussed in Chapter II. It should be expanded to include at least completion data and it should be coded in such a way that the 101's, 102's, and 103's could be cross-coded to the appropriate section.

Related to these recommendations are four other suggestions dealing with basic problems of data utilization. First, there is the matter of terminology and definition: a concerted effort is needed to develop a uniform glossary of terms used. Second, there is the need to prepare data in such form that component statistics can be used interchangeably regardless of which time period is convenient for a particular agency or purpose. Third, occupational groupings are at present in a chaotic, arbitrary state—the fragmentation of projects according to local usage renders classification frequently impossible. The need for an orderly code book, including an alphabetical cross index by occupations and variations of occupations is vital. At present, the listing is additive rather than logical or systematic. Finally, great attention should be given to the local or regional data processing, retrieval and reporting systems. The absence of needed personnel, the focus on data for reporting alone, the carelessness of record management, and other often-noted obstacles to obtaining information on trainees, are cited here to urge the improvement of local office systems. In the long run the most important process data on training and trainees, the need for follow-up efforts, and the essential evaluation should be local.

MDTA needs an ongoing research and evaluation capability on the State level. Only in this way will it be possible to make the more complex decisions that will soon be required. To attain such capability, priority should be given to overhauling the data system.

Conclusions and Recommendations for Evaluation. It is not immodest to indicate that our original plan for evaluation, despite the difficulties encountered in executing it, is still a worthwhile model. If this sounds Procrustean and implies that the design has priority over the realities of the field or the conditions of the data let us hasten to insist that a worthwhile goal for improving the data system is to enable the implementation of this design. We repeat, therefore, that the design itself is a good plan for an evaluation study.

The concept of evaluation should include the following additional factors. First, costs should be included. Second, involvement of the Employment Service, its baseline data, its details about trainee characteristics, its selection and its eventual disposition of applicants as well as completed trainees, is essential for a full evaluation. The collaboration (collaboration rather than cooperation) of the Labor Department is essential. Furthermore, evaluation on the project level may be an even more important focus than the global approach that characterizes most evaluation efforts.

The most important problem is the development of criteria. We have probed this question in Chapters II and III; we now state that implied criteria are not good enough. Thus, statistics which provide placements in training-related jobs are not valid criteria for program success. The absence of uniform terminology, including the loose and arbitrary definition of "disadvantaged" makes evaluation of success here also most difficult. While the criterion problem is primarily conceptual, it is also contingent on methodology and data precision. Fuzzy definitions are linked to loose conceptualization: ambiguity sometimes enhances administrative convenience, political demands, and vested interests. However, evaluation can hardly be accomplished under such circumstances.

It may seem that we are being rather demanding in our discussion of criteria for an effective evaluation but the development of standards is surely one of the goals of evaluation research. Suchman distinguishes between evaluation research and evaluation, pointing out that the former necessitates rigorous criteria and methodology that are rarely followed whereas the latter involves an everyday activity, that of placing values on phenomena, certainly not requiring research as much as a system of values. It would be most helpful to develop a scale of designs for appraising program efforts, from rigorous objectivity on the one hand to explicitly stated subjective values on the other.

Our suggestions for a scale of evaluation efforts, properly labeled, with the bias and value system indicated, should contribute to a clarification of the evaluation problem. Above all, the continued use of the word "evaluation" as an interchangeable label for a great variety of activities is deplorable. It is therefore not helpful for us to present a master design for a monster evaluation research project in which a complete list of all variables would be provided but rather to make it possible for public officials, legislators and administrators to have a better framework from which to select a specific level of evaluation study to be conducted. This would minimize the chance that mixed communications about what is actually being done would interfere with appropriate use of staff and resources and would maximize the effective cooperation of the individual agency or program. Thus, a small study dealing with selected variables, or a follow-up for a doctoral research, or the publicity and public relations requirements of an individual school system should require a somewhat different level of clerical and interview effort from an official large-scale, comprehensive, scientific study. There is no need for administrators, teachers, clerks, or trainees to extend themselves repeatedly for an undiscriminated range of "studies."

In his 1967 monograph, Mangum points out that assessment of MDTA Program success as a whole is difficult yet feasible, but that the second great need, an "assessment of the degree to which various program components have contributed to those objectives. . . is beyond the reach of current information" (p. 8). One contribution of the present study, it is felt, is that it explores in some depth the problem of program components. In this section we attempt to amplify this area of research as well as to consider the general feasibility of MDT research in New York State.

First, despite the huge gaps in data, the cooperativeness of center personnel made it possible to gather an enormous amount of information about program components. We believe, however, that it is both necessary and feasible to add to the design of the study as described in Chapter IV the following:

- Interviews with current trainees
- Questionnaires for all staff
- Visits to employers
- Further discussions with Board of Education personnel other than center staff
- Several samples of former trainees
- Detailed study of teaching process
- Examination of records in depth
- Conferences with Employment Service personnel
- Conferences with community agencies

Second, we believe that obtaining objective data about enrollment, class size, trainee composition, dropout, etc. is difficult but possible; and is needed to correlate with perceptions of center staffs.

Third, our study shows that at the statewide level, a study requires a large investment in staff, time, and funds. Any state considering statewide evaluation might, however, profit from our experience and first conduct a feasibility study, a general survey, and review the data bank—all this for a modest sum. After this, priorities for in-depth investigation might be established. In scanning the field as we did, we are persuaded that *the priorities in New York State lie first in data systematization, clarification of terminology, cooperation between Education and Labor Departments, after which a basic design such as ours may indeed be feasible.*

Fourth, *an ongoing program of research and study, including but not limited to evaluation, should be considered an essential feature of the total MDT program.* In further sections, suggestions for a variety of studies of instruction, delivery of services, trainee progress, etc. are included. These may contribute to evaluation but are clearly necessary apart from evaluation—for a variety of purposes. However, in closing this section, we urge that the establishment of a framework, a program of ongoing research, should have priority over study designs, on the one hand, or exclusive evaluation research, on the other.

The Program Components

We now turn from the needs and recommendations for improving the information and data systems, and for developing a program of study and research—to the findings of our study of the multi-centers—the program components themselves. In the following sections we review selected findings and emphasize areas for further study where needed, as well as make recommendations for program implementation where warranted.

Review of Administration, Staff and Facilities. By and large both administration and planning are highly centralized activities with New York City, perhaps, more centralized than the rest of the State. In all centers, however, there was a clear desire for more autonomy on the part of center directors.

Typical staff characteristics could be summarized as male, over forty, married, predominantly white, especially at the administrative-supervisory level. The notable exception to the black-white distribution was New York City with a preponderance of black center administrators and skills teachers. In general, educational level was correlated with job level; with skills teachers typically at less than baccalaureate level.

In general, very little use was made of aides or paraprofessionals, but apparently there was no difficulty in recruiting new staff. However, there were clear problems in retaining staff, especially during the recent uncertainties of funding. Administrators tended to have high position stability and this was also true for supervisors and skills teachers. However, basic education teachers as well as counselors had rather low average tenure. Remuneration, in general, seemed either comparable to or better than prevailing rates elsewhere except for administrators whose incomes appeared to be rather low considering their levels of responsibility. Special concern was raised about the hourly basis for payment, as against other possible arrangements. Staff benefits are practically nonexistent. Despite the rather low state of morale found at the time of the field visits (which was a frustrating period due to the long delay in funding), job satisfaction over the long haul is quite high with a very great desire on the part of most staff to remain in this field of work.

There is practically no staff training, either preservice or inservice. The main exception, other than informal or occasional examples to meet periodic needs, is the excellent AMIDS training program which has been provided, however, for only a small number of staff.

Facilities are generally adequate, but are typically old, converted, even abandoned plants. Certain specific aspects of facilities are notably inadequate such as eating arrangements. In general, the range of all facilities goes from excellent to poor but the latter is quite exceptional and is never the prevailing quality at any center.

Recommendations Concerning Administration, Staff, and Facilities. *There seems to be a need to increase the autonomy of center administrators. The corollary of this recommendation is decentralization. In this regard the designation, "teacher-in-charge" in New York City seems to be anachronistic. Furthermore, administrators' pay scales should be reviewed carefully, as they appear to be low. Finally, careful thought must be given to recruiting administrative and supervisory personnel from non-white staff in view of the increasing needs for indigenous leadership.*

Further recommendations concerning staff include the following: *there seem to be greater possibilities for using paraprofessional that should be fully explored. There do seem to be a number of reasons why the hourly rate should be replaced by a more professional approach to compensation. In view of the variations in turnover, a study in this area is recommended. This should include exploring the establishment of a baseline of staff tenure.*

One whole group of recommendations deals with staff training. First, it would seem that credit and degree programs at colleges and universities should be offered in this important educational specialty. *We strongly recommend the establishment of a formal statewide preservice training program to be carefully distinguished from local orientation for new staff. Furthermore, we recommend a structured, on-going program of inservice training, the core of which could well be AMIDS with additional courses as necessary; and which could be amplified through the selective use of colleges and universities.*

Our Swedish consultant provided an insight into the possibility of a permanent core of staff to be recruited and trained for MDT service. *If the problems of fluctuating funding could be solved, it would appear that a commitment to relative staff permanence should be seriously considered.*

The need for permanent, first-rate facilities should be given great consideration. The ad hoc, emergency, crisis atmosphere of most aspects of MDT is, of course, contingent on larger policy decisions, but the need for respectable facilities is deemed by us to be a major program priority.

Not considered previously to any major extent and perhaps notable by its absence, has been any discussion of the relationship of MDT multi-centers to the community. There would appear to have been very little effort in this regard, with some exceptions. *For purposes of planning, community relations and effective training, leadership is needed to help centers establish lines for consultation and participation by the communities involved.*

Review of Occupational Training, Basic Education, and Counseling. The phase of the study reviewed here is not a direct assessment of the training process but is based primarily on responses by the staffs of the multi-centers to selected aspects of the program.

It would appear that MDT centers play very little role in the selection and assignment of trainees inasmuch as the Employment Service has this responsibility. Similarly, transfer to new programs is slowed because of the need for Employment Service approval.

The enrollment in training during the period of this study was not easy to generalize but appeared to be (even in the abnormal period of funding) somewhat lower in New York City than the rest of the State. Regardless of location, however, the enrollment was substantially below capacity. It was generally estimated by responsible staff that such enrollment was heavily composed of "disadvantaged" trainees but this is a highly subjective definition as the concept of disadvantaged varied from center to center.

The organization of skills classes showed New York City to have shorter periods with greater diversity and distribution of experiences as compared with the rest of the State. In general, class sizes were small ranging on the average from six to fifteen trainees but rarely more than twenty.

Curriculum is essentially a centralized responsibility in New York City but is determined at each center in the rest of the State.

Skills Teaching methods were characteristically demonstrations, practice sessions, lectures, and group discussions: however, since lectures were rated least effective, it is notable that teachers persist in using this approach. Other aspects of teaching methods were reflected in the matter of prevention of absenteeism and dropout. Here, teachers perceived positive, developmental methods as more effective than punitive or negative methods; but it was interesting to note that positive methods were used more often by blue collar teachers than white collar teachers. In general, compared to actual dropout rates, it appeared that staff typically made low estimates or were not entirely aware of how the actual figures compared with their estimates. Their perceptions of reasons for dropping out conformed to other sources of information, with health, child care and family factors being most frequent.

Most instructors assessed trainee learning through highly subjective evaluation methods with little evidence to support their generally positive evaluation of trainee progress. In general, teachers indicated, more often implicitly than explicitly, that successful trainees tended to have middle class attitudes.

There seemed to be a great range of attitudes towards prevocational training with concern and dissatisfaction a recurrent theme, perhaps more so than approval. A State Education Department opinionnaire found similar results and it would appear that a focused study of prevocational training is in order.

In regard to basic education, the method or procedure of the assignment of trainees does not appear to be systematic and thus remains rather vague. The basic education teachers themselves appear to have considerable autonomy in the choice of curriculum and content. While there is great agreement by staff on the fact that basic education and skills are correlated, the method and evidence of correlation are vague and undocumented. Although the numbers enrolled are also imprecise it would appear that the vast majority receive some basic education.

Basic education seems to be conducted in small groups and in relatively short blocks of time. The essential methods are practice and group discussion. While there is a positive opinion of its usefulness, very little use is made of standard achievement tests for assessment purposes.

There was, of course, highly generalized agreement as to the basic need for counseling services but not as to the type and content of this counseling. Generally, counselors are quite autonomous. They appear to have contact with 100 percent of enrollees, but there is some question as to the nature of this service and how the need for service is determined. Despite the frequent mention of home contacts by supervisors the counselors themselves apparently did very little in this area. Furthermore, despite the supervisors' perception of group counseling as the predominant method of counselor functioning, counselors reports indicated that they actually spent more time in individual services. Groups tended to run from eleven to twenty in size with sessions about once a week. Group sessions were primarily concerned with work and work-related problems. In contrast, individual counseling was more personal in content.

Again, there was widespread agreement on the effectiveness of the counseling services but nowhere was there a system or criterion for assessing such effectiveness. There was general agreement as well as specific examples of the many other supportive services that are needed in the centers, such as legal, medical, and personal, but approaches to a delivery system for such services varied considerably.

Recommendations Concerning Occupational Training, Basic Education and Counseling. Recommendations for the areas reviewed above are of two kinds: those that emerge from our analysis and those that are urged by center staff members.

We recommend that decisions about trainee transfer should rest primarily with the training center staff; this is a professional responsibility rather than administrative.

We suggest that in the matter of curriculum selection and decisions a study is needed of the relative effectiveness of centralized versus decentralized approaches. We also feel that the use made of advisory committees should be clarified.

In view of the difficulty in obtaining accurate enrollment figures we believe that much better reporting data are needed to provide not only actual enrollment but a much clearer picture of the numbers who are disadvantaged. The great variations in definition of the disadvantaged has made the estimates seem unrealistic.

We strongly recommend a study of teaching practices in MDT, a study which would probe the extent to which specific or special methods are used in these programs. Although effective results may be obtained through use of "traditional" or standard methods, the conspicuous examples of innovation, such as ITA in basic education in New York City or student responsibility for peer instruction as in Rochester are too infrequent. In addition, *a manual or handbook* *of successful methods, and materials is very much needed, not as a crutch but as a guideline to the kind of useful improvisation or adaptations of standards methods that have worked in MDT.*

In the matter of trainee learning *we suggest that greater use of standardized achievement tests including the development of local norms should be one of several attacks on the present highly subjective method of evaluating progress, in skills training as well as in basic education. In addition, daily individualized progress evaluations such as appear in some shops should be considered for general adoption.*

The pool of recommendations from various MDT staff includes several noteworthy suggestions which are not necessarily endorsed by the present investigators but which merit inclusion at this point, primarily as foci for intensive study. There is some feeling that the training day is too long and that it should be shortened, and thus, training should be stretched over more time. There are many staff members, however (proportions on each side are not clear), who oppose this, feeling that lengthening the training period decreases the likelihood of completion and of early job placement. Some instructors feel that they do not have enough time for daily preparation and would like such a period set aside. Blue collar teachers would like larger blocks of time for their shop periods. They also recommend more field visits, more contact with private industry, better buildings, and in one area they feel that trainees should be given their own tools.

Staff recommendations on the prevocational program range from generally unfavorable outside New York City to mixed in New York City, with a predisposition to eliminate prevocational training for adults. Staff recommendations concerning basic education were so varied that no generalizations can be made except for one conspicuous factor, namely, that opinions of basic education were almost entirely dependent on the specialty of the respondent.

Staff recommendations from other than counselors pointed toward some dissatisfaction with the type of counselor and counseling being used. They urged less personal psychological counseling and suggested more work-oriented reality involved counselors. There was also a number of scattered but nonetheless interesting and important suggestions in this area including greater use of black counselors, different training for counselors and the possibility that in MDT the term "counseling" itself was inappropriate inasmuch as the range of activities was so broad.

As we reviewed the actualities and the potential of these programs we did feel that many of these suggestions merited serious consideration. Certainly the assignment of trainees to basic education seemed haphazard. Certainly the correlation between skills and basic education requires considerable spelling out. In the area of counseling better and more differentiated trainee screening should replace present omnibus service. Furthermore, a study is needed of what counselor activities and functions are actually like, including the real extent of home contacts, the actual time in individual or group activities and the possibility of amplifying the counselors' perscribed role so that the many informal or ascribed duties are formalized.

Implications and Recommendations for Program Policy and Planning

Thus far we have addressed the evaluation and research problems, the program components, and needed study and improvements therein. We have raised numerous questions, suggesting and recommending where we felt there was sound basis in our study. At this point, however, we turn to three issues of the total MDTA program which need comment, clarification and urgent consideration inasmuch as they involve basic policies and prospects.

The Target Population Reconsidered. *The first area requiring extensive clarification in terms of both data and policy is the target population.* Our review of current trainee characteristics (Chapter VII) shows that at least a third consists of high school graduates, a figure which conforms with the total for institutional trainees. The perception of center staffs, however, that the programs now consist of an almost entirely disadvantaged population hardly agrees with the descriptive data we have. But it is understandable that educators might have a distorted picture—they are entirely the recipients of referrals from other agencies; and have no control over, or participation in planning for appropriate target groups.

The proportion of disadvantaged should not be merely mandated for the state as a whole in compliance with the federal act, but should be more substantially controlled and balanced. If the highest proportion of "advantaged," white, retraining groups go into OJT (see all statistical summaries for discrepancy between institutional and OJT) then institutional becomes entirely associated with very difficult training problems.

At the present, however, it would seem that whatever the selection process is, the actual trainee population appears to be rather conformist, passive, acceptant rather than hard-core. Although anecdotal data in some centers suggests that a minority of young male trainees are there "for the ride," the allowance, etc., by and large, trainees appear to be well-motivated, middle class oriented, adapted to the programs. The proportion of dissent is small, the negativism likewise. The attitudes of teachers and other staff appear to reward such trainee attitudes and behavior; and the real nature of dropouts and noncompleters is not clear. Thus, there is scattered evidence that some dropouts are superior, are able to master skills early, to enter the job market themselves, etc. The criterion problem looms large here so long as the gross labels "dropout" and "completer," prevail in undifferentiated form.

The problem of the real hard-core, the alienated, the negative, the unchannelized does not seem to have been addressed substantially if our demographic data and trainee attitudes are meaningful indicators.

The Occupational Course Offerings: Safe and Cyclical. A second way of confronting the issues of MDT as revealed by this study is to focus on the course offerings. In terms of such vital social goals as filling initial job vacancies as well as upgrading the poor and ill-trained to desirable vacancies, it appears that at present, in New York State as elsewhere, job openings still appear to be concentrated in two areas: those requiring long training time or offering low pay. It appears that MDT course offerings have provided much more for the latter type of opening than the former.

Despite the dubious 235 occupations claimed to be the figure in 1968 (see Chapter III), there has been a systematic decrease in both number and variety of offerings. There is a serious question as to whether the residual of courses offered are not now the stereotyped, less desirable, thus leaving public programs with the safe and cyclical rather than the innovative and experimental. The following propositions are offered as bases for planning course offerings:

1. *MDTA should not be committed to the existing characteristics of the labor market* because, at present, the market is not flexible

enough to meet the needs of MDTA's target populations. This will become more important as the program's retraining function diminishes further and its identification with the anti-poverty effort increases.

2. **An effective MDTA operation will have a well-defined policy for evaluating training proposals on the basis of their suitability for the short- and long-range requirements of the labor market and of the people to be served. A high proportion of training activities will be in long-range demand occupations with accessible career ladders.** ***In its broadest implication, this suggests that an effective MDTA effort would involve an on-going research arm charged with the responsibility for defining new training needs in emerging career areas.***
3. ***Existing short-range demand occupations, such as keypunch operation, will also be represented in the training mix of an effective MDTA program but such a program will not assign trainees haphazardly to such jobs. For example, young people with heavy family responsibilities would not be shunted into job areas where the demand is likely to become weak.***
4. **Similarly,** ***an effective program would not ignore the potential of non-career ladder jobs such as security operatives and taxi-cab drivers. But again, it would be selective about the people it placed in such positions; that is, it would not train young people in these areas.***

There is sufficient evidence to suggest that MDTA in New York needs to take a careful look at its own planning processes in two vital respects.

1. ***There does not seem to be any systematic provision for keeping the program relevant to the labor market.*** **Course offerings seem, instead,**

to be determined by budgetary considerations (it is much less expensive to offer last year's courses than to develop new ones). But, the labor market is in the midst of a revolution brought on by such things as new legislation and a third generation of automation. MDTA will have to respond to these demand changes eventually; it ought to be able to anticipate the new needs and allow for orderly, planned transition, now.

2. *The manner in which MDTA seems to plan in terms of the needs of its clients is no more sophisticated than the elementary proposition that they need jobs.* One of the tacit assumptions of the program is that more than half of the trainees need jobs in the three traditional occupational areas. The way in which the Department of Labor focuses on its statistics suggests, in fact, that one of the principal program criteria is the percentage of trainees who remain in "training-related" jobs down through the years. This sort of cost-accounting evaluation is almost antithetical to the imaginative planning needed to keep abreast of the rising expectations of the poor.

MDTA: Cornerstone of Manpower Policy or Shifting Sands of Expediency?

Even in the face of major thrusts by the Federal Administration, the Congress and the State Government, the program as described is hardly compatible with a cornerstone of policy. In a sense, the many positives we have recorded are accomplishments in spite of numerous obstacles. Thus, in considering questions of staff recruitment, training and tenure as well as the problem of facilities and training environment, a fundamental issue recurs sufficiently to neutralize certain recommendations which otherwise appear to be persuasive. This issue is the extent to which manpower training should indeed be a permanent, regularized activity. That is, arguments in favor of permanence have the potential for creating a second line, perhaps a second-rate form of training in which the word "manpower" is in itself an adjective connoting inferiority. On the other hand, the reality in American education and of the labor market argue just as persuasively for a long-range, well-planned system of training and retraining which is outside the regular educational system, and yet linked to it. Our study has not provided sufficient data on either side on which to base strong recommendations. As such our recommendations are second order, much more administrative than policy and planning. The implementation of these or any other recommendations, however, would seem to be more dependent on resolving precisely such questions of policy as are indicated above. The Swedish model is based on a societal consensus which places great value on all training efforts and sees training and retraining as a permanent institution of continuing education for out-of-school adults. In our case societal ambivalence does not permit a similar commitment. It is clear that the virtue of a permanent staff of manpower professionals with career commitments is a great asset to the Swedish system and could conceivably be a fundamental asset to a reorganized American system. However, no easy translation from one to the other can be made at this time. A previous model for a rapid change of this kind is the overnight creation, so to speak, with long-term Federal promotion and funding, of the rehabilitation counselor, now a permanent well-established profession.

Again, the shift in Sweden to permanent plant and facilities is a most attractive model. But the continuity and administrative discretion in funding which makes the Swedish system seem so utopian to the student of the American recycling trauma, is probably the most attractive feature of all. Again, but even more so, the same issue is at stake. It is whether we take a continuous view of human training and retraining as the Swedish do or whether we subject each program to the vicissitudes of pressure groups, political fluctuations and fiscal controls. It should be noted that the issue as thus formulated contains within it a sub-issue which in itself needs to be clarified. This is the extent to which ours is a "training program" and the extent to which Sweden's is a "re-training program." The contrast is not necessarily an American versus Swedish matter. The preponderance of our program is devoted to entry level, beginning level, lower level occupations and only very few courses are truly up-grading. As a result, especially in a review of the multi-centers, one emerges with a picture of a highly restricted occupational range in which the concept of retraining and upgrading is practically non-functioning.

Perhaps much of the foregoing seems philosophical; yet here is the heart of the matter. In essence, the broad developmental perspective which holds the improvement of the total citizen as a social goal is at odds with a narrow cost-effective model of quickest entry into the labor market. The course that is chosen will reflect the critical concerns and the social values of our society for some time to come. We conclude on this note, hoping that we have contributed to a consideration of the issues.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Management Association. Training Activities by Type of Training, Cost of Training and SIC, Research Monograph, 1968.

Christiansen, Dorothy (Compiler). "Evaluating Education Programs: A Bibliography" in The Urban Review, Vol. 3, No. 4, Center for Urban Education: New York, February 1969.

Edgerton, Harold A. "The Prediction of Outcomes of MDTA Programs," in Research in Vocational and Technical Education, The University of Wisconsin, Center for Studies in Vocational and Technical Education, 1967.

Ehresman, N. D., Evenson, L. S., Fischer, F. N. An Analysis of the Effectiveness of the MDTA Institutional Programs in North Dakota, 1962-1966, Research Report, No. 12, Center for Research in Vocational and Technical Education, University of North Dakota: Grand Forks, North Dakota, 1968.

"Evaluating Educational Programs: Symposium" in The Urban Review, Vol. 3, No. 4, Center for Urban Education: New York, February 1969.

Greenleigh Associates. Opening the Doors: Job Training Programs, A Report to the Committee on Administration of Training Programs, New York, 1968.

Kirkpatrick, James J., et al. Testing and Fair Employment, New York University Press, New York, 1968.

Kotz, Arnold (Ed.). Occupational Education: Planning and Programming, Vol. Two, Stanford Research Institute: Menlo Park, Calif., 1967.

Levitan, Sar A. Antipoverty Work and Training Efforts: Goals and Reality, Policy Papers in Human Resources and Industrial Relations, No. 3, The Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, and The National Manpower Policy Task Force, Washington, D.C., 1967.

Levitan, Sar A., and G. L. Mangum. Making Sense of Federal Manpower Policy, Policy Papers in Human Resources and Industrial Relations, No. 2, The Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, and The National Manpower Policy Task Force, Washington, D.C., 1967.

London, H. H. How Fare MDTA Ex-Trainees? An Eighteen Months Follow-up Study of Five Hundred Such Persons, Clearinghouse For Federal and Scientific Information, Springfield, Virginia, 1967.

Main, Earl D. A Nationwide Evaluation of MDTA Institutional Job Training Programs, National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., 1966.

Mangum, Garth L. Contributions and Costs of Manpower Development and Training, Policy Papers in Human Resources and Industrial Relations, No. 5, The Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations and the National Manpower Policy Task Force, Washington, D.C., 1967.

Mangum, Garth L. MDTA: Foundation of Federal Manpower Policy, The Johns Hopkins Press: Baltimore, Maryland, 1968.

Manpower Report of the President, Including Report on Manpower Requirements, Resources, Utilization, and Training, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C., 1969.

New York Council on Economic Development. Economic Characteristics of the New York Labor Market: 1967, New York, 1968.

New York State Education Department. Division of Special Occupational Services. Manpower Development and Training in New York State, Annual Reports, Albany, N.Y.

New York State Interdepartmental Committee on Low Incomes. Discrimination and Low Incomes: Social and Economic Discrimination Against Minority Groups in Relation to Low Incomes in New York State, Albany, N.Y., 1967.

New York State Department of Labor, Division of Research and Statistics, Manpower Directions, New York State, 1965-1975, Job Requirements and Labor Force, Albany, N.Y., 1968.

New York State Department of Labor, Operations, monthly publication of the Research and Statistics Office, Division of Employment, Albany, N.Y.

New York State Department of Labor. The Manpower Development and Training Institutional Programs: A Survey of Accomplishments in New York State, Albany, N.Y., 1968.

Nosow, Sigmund. Retraining under the Manpower Development Training Act: A Study of Attributes of Trainees Associated with Successful Retraining, Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information: Springfield, Virginia, 1968.

Suchman, Edward A. Evaluative Research: Principles and Practice in Public Service and Social Action Programs. Russell Sage Foundation: New York, 1967.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, County Business Patterns, 1967: New York, CBP-67-34. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1968.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Expanding the Choices, Education and Training, 5th Annual Report of the Secretary of H.E.W. to the Congress on Manpower Development and Training Act, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Learning for Jobs, Education and Training, 6th Annual Report of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to the Congress on the Manpower Development and Training Act, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, A Chance to Advance, Education and Training, 7th Annual Report of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to the Congress on the Manpower Development and Training Act, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration. The Effectiveness of the Training Program under MDTA, A Nationwide Evaluation, mimeographed, 1965.

U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration. Manpower Research Projects, through June 30, 1968, Washington, D.C., 1968.

U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration. The Influence of MDTA Training on Earnings, Manpower Evaluation Report, No. 8, Washington, D.C., 1968.

U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration. The Manpower Research Institutional Grant Program; The First Three Years, 1968-1969, Washington, D.C., 1969.

APPENDIX A

PLAN FOR EVALUATION OF THE MDTA PROGRAMS IN NEW YORK STATE

I. Introduction

The general problem of program evaluation is nowhere more clearly manifested than in the specific area of manpower training. The breadth, magnitude, variety of programs; the geographic distribution; the several years of operation plus the current activities; facilities as well as curriculum, staff and actual instruction; and, finally, goals in relation to actual outcomes. The scope of the programs, the need for evaluation, and the discrepancy between need and resources: these are recurrent challenges in evaluation.

When the particular program, that of New York State, is viewed, it is apparent that more than 5 years of experience have produced a huge body of facts and data; and a great range of administrative and operational patterns, innovations and experiments, and results and outcomes. The many problems that needed to be solved have given rise to creative and adaptive efforts, the record of which is sometimes no longer available. The value of studying this major program of occupational education is underscored by the fact that the problem of manpower training is likely to remain a major concern of our society and that the patterns are far from set. Thus, although the very conditions of implementing the Manpower Development and Training Act include program evaluation, the need to conduct such an evaluation is most important because of the richness of the past experience and what it could contribute to further development.

II. The Need for and Significance of the Evaluation

The need for an evaluation is proportionate to the need for a program. If manpower training and retraining are vital social needs, then clearly the measurement of success is an obligation and a challenge. The variables which enter into success are greatly in need of specification and measurement, but the criteria of success are themselves in need of greater specification. The needs are indeed many: they include better guidelines for improving program administration and supervision, utilization of resources and facilities, and, of course, instruction. The need to know which kinds of occupational training have the best success, what is the nature of and reasons for failure to complete training, and how relevant training has been to actual employment are self-evident. Although the degree of detail and subtlety is a function of practicality, the need for hard analysis of available and obtainable data is possibly more important than extensive data-gathering itself.

However, it may well be that an historical perspective is especially needed as characteristics of trainees continue to change and as occupational needs vary. The focus on improving the development of disadvantaged individuals is perhaps the central need of a thorough evaluation.

III. An Evaluation Plan

On a scientific sampling basis, which will include all of the centers offering multi-occupational training and representative programs of specific occupational training, the following elements of evaluation will be undertaken:

1. What is the trainee dropout situation and why?
2. What is the specific nature of employment outcome for those who complete training; immediately after training? 6 months or longer, after training?
3. How does employment success or failure relate to the training taken?

4. What aspects of training need improvement or change?

As the details of the evaluation procedures emerge, within the availability of time and staff, every effort will be made to probe into other factors of instructional effectiveness and their relationships to program goals.

Evaluation along these lines will require two major directions of inquiry: the first by mail questionnaires to school officers and trainee graduates, and the second by field investigation through interviews and evaluation instruments. The types of sampling will include several breakdowns: the several geographic areas, male-female, youth-adult, program types (multi, regular, coupled OJT, individual referral and their variations), and, finally, occupational groups.

The types of study to be conducted will include the ordering and analysis of already available statistical data and records, the eliciting of further quantitative data through questionnaires and surveys, both for the total MDTA program in certain instances and for selected samples in others. Interviews, visitations and observations in order to obtain a body of data beyond the available records should result in both statistical and qualitative analyses. Samples of former and current trainees, employers, instructors, Boards of Education, employment service offices, will be visited and interviewed.

IV. Expected Outcomes and Implications

While certain limitations of budget and of available data impose limitations on outcomes, it is expected nevertheless that a comprehensive review of the total program will be effective in several ways. First of all, the very process of evaluation should be helpful to all participants as a stimulus to self-examination: especially, an independent evaluation should result in cross-fertilization of perceptions and viewpoints. Second, it should produce data which go beyond rumor, intuition, and impression. Third, the fleshing-out of statistical data should invest further meaning to sometimes sterile summary figures and tables. Fourth, a focus on actual instructional content and method should help in the improvement of training programs. Finally, the opportunity to compare stated goals and actual achievement should help in both the goal-setting and the implementation areas.

V. Reports

It is planned that reports will be provided beginning June 15, 1968 and at quarterly intervals thereafter, with a final report no later than May 15, 1969.

APPENDIX B

N.Y.U. MDTA Study (1968–1969)

PROPOSED SITE VISIT SCHEDULE

Location ______________________________
(Address)

Director ______________________________ Phone __________

Date	Team Leader:	Observer:	Associate:
9:30–10:30	Center Administrator Interview	Observations	Supervisor Interview (2)
10:30–11:30	Supervisor Interview (1)		Supervisor Interview (3)
11:30–12:30	Basic Ed. Instructor Interview		Counselor Interview
12:30–1:30			
1:30–2:30	Skills Instructor Interview (1)	Skills Instructor Interview (2)	Trainee Questionnaire Administered
2:30–3:30	Skills Instructor Interview (3)	Skills Instructor Interview (4)	Trainee Questionnaire Administered
3:30–			